

explain the Holocaust revisionist point of view, we thought of doing it on Internet. The purpose was to provide a complete library shelf to the curious and free minds, displaying revisionist works as well as other works hostile to them. The reader would then be in a position to choose after having accessed to the many sides of the questions.

This huge program has been fulfilled up to the three quarters. The reader shall find on our site the main contribution to the revisionist approach and large chunks of the writings by those who try to bury it. To reach that stage, we have toiled a lot for nine long years and we feel now the need to breathe. For a while. It would be uncautious to go into more details. Our little team remains anonymous out of the necessity to maintain this work above the waters. Many groups, hostile to the practical use of freedom, are trying to erase our site from the web in order to protect the genocide programme which takes place in Palestine, the whole of historic Palestine. We need to take some rest, to do other things, to reorganize the site which has grown wildly, to read other books. To prepare for future actions.

We are then going to slow down. We shall of course continue to upload the site, always with the same goal: provide a library on these subjects, as complete as possible. We shall continue to provide an account of the world revisionist scene, probably not on a monthly basis, but rather on three-months instalments, like a quarterly. The same for the actuality of the Middle East and the instrumentalization of the WW II Jewish suffering by the Israeli colonialism cum racism.

We do not bow nor give up anything. Only the rhythm of our interventions will change, not the substance. We need only to better steer our way into this troubled period. We take potshots from our adversaries but they can't win. We have to thank them to keep us alert and we also thank our friends, all those in fact for whom we work right now, keeping in mind those of the future.

May the 1st, 2005

Team AAARGH

ZIONIST COUNTERATTACK

Lord Ahmed's unwelcome guest (= I. Shamir)

Stephen Pollard

The Labour peer must admit his error in inviting an extreme anti-Semite to air his views

A TERM has returned to the lexicon of political debate in recent months; a term for which, in a decent world, we should have no need. That term is "anti-Semitism".

In January, Labour produced two posters. One depicted Michael Howard as a Shylock or Fagin caricature. The other pasted the faces of Mr Howard and Oliver Letwin on to pigs' bodies. In February, figures showed that anti-Semitic attacks rose to record levels in 2004 — 42 per cent higher than in 2003. Add to this Ken Livingstone's comparison of a Jewish reporter to a concentration camp guard, and the odour of anti-Semitism is clearly with us once more.

But there is a more astonishing incident which has yet to receive any coverage. Lord Ahmed, who has been a Labour life peer since 1998, is the first Muslim to have been so honoured. His presence in the House of Lords is symbolically important. His behaviour matters, both in the message it sends to his fellow Muslims and in what it represents to the

rest of us.

In May, Lord Ahmed called — at considerable personal risk — for Islamic militants such as Abu Hamza and Omar Bakri to be deported. The risk was real: a fatwa was immediately issued against him.

But his behaviour has not always been so admirable. On February 23, Lord Ahmed hosted a book launch in the House of Lords for **a man going by the name of Israel Shamir**. “Israel Shamir” is, in fact, a Swedish-domiciled anti-Semite also known as Jöran Jermas.

The gist of Shamir/Jermas’s speech at the meeting can be gleaned from its title, “Jews and the Empire”. It included observations such as: “All the [political] parties are Zionist-infiltrated.” “Your newspapers belong to Zionists . . . Jews indeed own, control and edit a big share of mass media, this mainstay of Imperial thinking.” “In the Middle East we have just one reason for wars, terror and trouble — and that is Jewish supremacy drive . . . in Iraq, the US and its British dependency continue the same old fight for ensuring Jewish supremacy in the Middle East.” “The Jews like an Empire . . . This love of Empire explains the easiness Jews change their allegiance . . . Simple minds call it ‘treacherous behaviour’, but it is actually love of Empire per se.” “Now, there is a large and thriving Muslim community in England . . . they are now on the side of freedom, against the Empire, and they are not afraid of enforcers of Judaic values, Jewish or Gentile. This community is very important in order to turn the tide.”

Why would Lord Ahmed have hosted such a man in the Lords? It is, of course, possible that Lord Ahmed had no idea that Shamir/Jermas was a rabid anti-Semite. Yet it takes only a quick Google to discover his views and background. He has worked for *Zavtra*, Russia’s most anti-Semitic publication, and is allied with the Vanguard News Network, set up by an American, Alex Linder — a man so extreme that he was even ostracised by the US neo-Nazi National Alliance.

Indeed, Shamir/Jermas’s own website proudly reprints his views: “Jews asked God to kill, destroy, humiliate, exterminate, defame, starve, impale Christians, to usher in Divine Vengeance and to cover God’s mantle with blood of goyim . . .” “The Ashkenazi Jews believed that spilled Jewish blood has a magic effect of calling down Divine Vengeance on the heads of the Gentiles . . . The picture of Jews slaughtering children for cultic reasons exerted huge impact on the Christian peoples of Europe.” On and on it goes.

Other figures at the forefront of campaigns against Israel are wise to Shamir/Jermas’s toxic anti-Semitism; Ali Abunimah, for example, who writes for the Electronic Intifada website and Hussein Ibish, press spokesman of the American-Arab Anti Discrimination Committee, gave warning in 2001 that Shamir/Jermas was not anti-Israeli but anti-Semitic. It is surely not unreasonable to expect Lord Ahmed to have exercised a cursory check on his guest.

If, however, Lord Ahmed does feel that he made a mistake in inviting him, he has yet to demonstrate it. Shamir/Jermas’s speech was made nearly two months ago. On learning of its contents, I wrote to Lord Ahmed, asking him two questions. Did he consider the invitation to have been a mistake? Did he condemn the remarks? He did not reply.

Yesterday, I phoned him. When I told him that I planned to write a piece drawing attention to his actions in hosting Shamir/Jermas and that I wanted to give him every opportunity to respond, he replied: **“I am not even going to speak with you.”** He then put the phone down.

Lord Ahmed’s refusal to condemn the remarks seems to indicate that he sees nothing wrong with inviting such a man to speak, or with the words Shamir/Jermas used. There is an instructive parallel. Howard Flight was stripped of the Conservative whip for expressing a mild opinion about spending cuts. Lord Ahmed invited a known anti-Semite to speak in the House of Lords, has not uttered a word of criticism since and remains a Labour peer. Before hearing from Lord Ahmed, I also wrote to Lord Grocott, the Labour Chief Whip in the Lords. I asked him if, given Lord Ahmed’s apparent lack of contrition, Lord Grocott considered it appropriate that Lord Ahmed should still hold the Labour whip? **No reply.**

All Lord Ahmed need do to destroy the notion that he supports Shamir/Jermas’s views is to admit that he made a mistake in inviting him, and to condemn his words.

Times Online April 07, 2005

<<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,1072-1557932,00.html>>

From Israel Shamir to the Times editor

Sir,

Re: Lord Ahmed's unwelcome guest

I was the "Lord Ahmed's unwelcome guest", according to Stephen Pollard (April 07, 2005). I was not unduly impressed by the appellation of "a notorious antisemite" for this term has been thoroughly debased like Henry the VIII's coin. *The Jewish Week* (April, 1 2005) condemned the Good Samaritan parable as "an antisemitic slur"; the Webster dictionary describes "antisemitism" as "adverse attitude to Israel's policies"; while Bar-Ilan University's Rabbi Dr. Pinchas Hayman told his listeners that "as long as Christians keep Jesus as God, they will be antisemitic". Mr Pollard's worldview was made clear by his reference to Ken Livingstone's affair. If a person who considers a Jewish hack being above reproach because of his Jewishness were to fail to consider me "an antisemite" I would be worried for I am adverse to Israel's policies, venerate Jesus Christ and admire the Good Samaritan. Moreover, I stand for full equality of Jew and non-Jew, in Palestine and elsewhere, and this is clearly an "antisemitic" position for Pollard and his kin.

I was even less impressed by Pollard's reference to my assumed Swedish name. Next time he may call Salman Rushdie "actually a Mr Wiggins, a resident of Bienfait, Saskatchewan". Writers'lot is not always an easy sailing. I walk under a fatwa not less scaring than that of Rushdie, for my name is on the hit list of Jewish Defense League, and I do not intend to be as accommodating to them as Mr Pollard perhaps would like. (This comparison goes a long way, for I am not less critical to Judaism than Mr Rushdie to Islam; but Jewish assassins are more successful than their Muslim competitors, and the British readers may remember Lord Moyne and many others.) Israeli newspapers are quite critical of me, but they never published such rubbish ("actually, a Swede...") for I am quite well known locally.

Pollard's attempts to establish my guilt by association are equally futile. I wrote not only for "*Zavtra*, Russia's most anti-Semitic publication" (on a par with Ken Livingstone and Prince Harry, I presume), but also for *Haaretz*, the leading Israeli newspaper that published an advertisement calling for "vengeance to the evil nation" of Palestinians; but somehow nobody mentions this moral fault of mine.

But I was thoroughly annoyed by Pollard's references to Lord Ahmed of Rotherham. Pollard presents elevation of Lord Ahmed, "the first Muslim peer" as an action connected to his faith, not to his personal achievement; he implies that Ahmed is under an obligation "to behave". This is quite shocking racist remark. There were and are dozens of Jewish peers, though Jewish community of Britain is many times smaller than the Muslim one. None of the Jewish peers considers himself admitted "on condition", and there is no reason to impose such a condition on a Muslim peer. That is, unless you have two different measures, one for Jews, another for ordinary mortals, as Mr Pollard apparently has.

The full text of my talk, **The Jews and Empire**, can be read on my site <<http://www.israelshamir.net/>> and it will be soon published in a book. And by the way, none of many Jews present at the talk considered it as 'antisemitic'.

Israel Shamir - Jaffa

Email: <info@israelshamir.net>

GAOL

After a nine year struggle by the Belgian government against his revisionist activities, Belgium's most prominent Revisionist, Siegfried Verbeke, received on 14 April 2005 a one year non-suspended prison sentence - "nicht auf Bewährung" = prison ferme - and 10 years loss of his political rights as a Belgian citizen. He will appeal - "Court of Cassation".

Contact Siegfried at <siegfriedverbeke@hotmail.com>

HEAVY BULLSHIT

The Reds, The Browns and the Greens or The Convergence of Totalitarianisms

aka Alexandre del Valle
(Real name : Marco Danna)

Since the instigation of the second Intifada al Aqsa, in September of 2000; since September 11, 2001, which marked the end of the inviolability of America's strategic sanctuary; and, above all, since the second Iraqi crisis, which has resulted in the dismantling of the regime of Saddam Hussein, one has been able to note throughout the West the emergence of a Red-Green-Brown Axis (the Red of the extreme left, the Brown of the extreme right, and the Green of Islamism). The different components of this Axis have for a common objective the struggle against the new faces of Evil: America, Israel, "Imperialism", and even the West in its entirety.

The objective alliances among these three ideologies, we will see, did not begin just yesterday. But it is undeniable that the events since the beginning of the new millennium have contributed particularly to their collusion. In effect, the use of the term "crusade" by George W. Bush on the day after September 11 has been seen as a provocation, as much among the anti-clerical extreme left and extreme right as it has among the Islamic milieus—whence the evermore revealing convergence among, on the one hand, those nostalgic for the first two totalitarianisms (the Browns and the Reds) and, on the other hand, the protagonists of revolutionary Islamism. These latter affect to defend the Arab masses who are "occupied" as much as the poor, the weak, and the "humiliated" of the Third World, the victims of the new Judeo-Christian "imperialist" Crusaders. The recent public standpoints expressed by the famous terrorist Carlos, among others, lead quite clearly in this direction (1).

It is evident that Islamism, the third totalitarianism after Nazism and Communism, echoes to a definite extent the aspirations of its two predecessors: seizing the struggle of civilizations and religions, then declaring war on the Judeo-Christian world in the name of the "dispossessed" of the rest of the planet, Islamism seduces as much those nostalgic for the pagan Third Reich, resolved to eradicate Judaism and Christianity, as it does those partisans of the hammer and sickle, determined to come to blows with the "bourgeois" and "capitalist" West. The nerve center of this despised system: Manhattan, "the planetary district of mercenaries of the economic and financial war that America wreaks on the world", according to the words of Carlos (2). It was no surprise, then, to see the Browns, the Reds and the Greens rejoice together at the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and to identify bin Laden as a new David against an imperial "American-Zionist" Goliath. It was no surprise, either, to witness the enthusiasm of these three totalitarian movements converge around the "heroic" struggle conducted since March 2003 by the remnant Baathist rebels and Islamist Shiites of Iraq against the American occupation of Mesopotamia.

Evidently, this Red-Brown-Green Axis of "anti-hegemonic" and "anti-imperialistic" hatred was reinforced since the first years of the 1990s and the fall of the Soviet Union. This paradoxical and neo-totalitarian assemblage has seen its apogee on the day after September 11 and, above all, during the winter and spring of 2003, with the benefit of the vast campaign of anti-Americanism conducted in the Western world by the opponents of the war against the regime of Saddam. This junction of Red, Brown and Green totalitarianisms around the cause of Palestinian martyrs, Iraqis and Afghans, as much as the revolutionary figure of Usama bin Laden, confirms the leadership, henceforth uncontested, of revolutionary Islamism. From now on, this exerts a real fascination upon the other totalitarian options defeated by history (Nazism and Communism) and, consequently, condemned either to reconstitute themselves or to join the Islamist revolution in order to pursue their struggle against liberal democracies.

From September 11 to the second Gulf War

If one follows the Red thread from the opposition to "Yankee imperialism", one sees that the anti-Zionist and anti-American milieus which had found extenuating circumstances in the commando of September 11 are those who try, today, to absolve Islamist terrorism—whether it pertains to the bin Ladenite movement across the globe or to Hamas and the Islamic Jihad in Palestine. Mesmerized by the collapse of the Twin Towers—a terrible illustration of the power of radical Islamism—, the Third Worldist and anti-

imperialist ideologues of the extreme left, along with other “counter-globalists”, had been the most vehement to castigate the American intervention in Afghanistan. These were the ones again who, one year later, organized the most virulent “pacifist” displays against the intervention in Iraq, displays equally conducted in the name of the “victims of Zionism”. Thus Toni Negri, the ex-ideologue of the Red Brigades and leading figure of the *No Global* movement, declared, in September of 2001, that his compassion did not extend to anyone but to illegal immigrants who might have disappeared with the Twin Towers. The Trotskyite linguist Noam Chomsky, well known for his violently anti-Israeli positions, denounced, in the attack of September of 11, a “planetary imposture”, yet another fascisizing manifestation of “American imperialism”. Worse: he imputed “the anger of the Islamists” to the “racist” drift of the Hebrew state. As far as the editor-in-chief of *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Alain Gresh, son of the celebrated pro-Soviet intellectual Henri Curiel goes, he justified, in his book written with Tariq Ramadan, the grandson of the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, the terrorist option of Palestinians in the name of anti-Zionism and “anti-colonialism”. (3)

Two recent, grave events merit particular attention: first of all, the exhortations of the new leaders of the Italian Red Brigades and of the famous “Red terrorist” Carlos to take up the fight of Hamas and al Qaeda; and then, the nearly unanimous appeal by Western neo-Nazi leaders to salute the “heroism” of Hezbollah and bin Laden in their struggle against the Jews and the Americans. The logical consequence of these parallel fascinations and alliances: Carlos embraces a “revolutionary Islamism destined to sweep the world,” an Islamism that “realizes the dynamic synthesis of different currents (the anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist struggle) and draws for its models of action upon socialism, Marxism and nationalism” (4); and, at the same time, the charismatic leader of the English neo-Nazi movement, David Myatt, now become Abdul Aziz ibn Myatt, appeals to those nostalgic Axis members and to all enemies of the Zionists, to embrace with him the Jihad, the “true martial religion” (5), which will most effectively fight against the Jews and the Americans. Another sign of this rapprochement: on April 3, 2003, the Salafist Londoner Omar Bakri Mohamed, leader of the movement al Mouhajiroun as well as being imam of the Finsbury Park mosque and a recruiter of a number of youths who went off to join al Qaeda, officially received Myatt and accorded him a “welcome into Islam”, specifying to journalists that the neo-Nazi past of this neophyte had “no special importance once their goals converged in common” (6)...

Parallel to this, as the discourse of Marxist terrorists or of certain neo-Nazis becomes Islamified, so too the rhetoric of bin Laden, in particular, and of Islamists in general becomes “Marxized” and “Third Worldized” in its turn, and—uniquely, certainly, unto a tactical aim—borrows, more and more, from the anti-Semitic vulgate of the extreme right. Thus, in his declaration of February 11, 2003, not only did the head of al Qaeda seize on that *bête noire* of the extreme left which is “the American-Zionist imperialism in Palestine”, recalling the “martyrdom of Vietnam”, but he also for the first time authorized the faithful to ally themselves with an Arab regime that was “atheist” and nationalist: “Although Saddam Hussein is an infidel, it becomes permissible to unite our forces with his in order to combat the American crusade against Islam and the Muslims.” Saddam himself, that atheist and old “pagan” admirer of Nebuchadnezzar had not ceased, since the first Gulf War, to Islamicize his discourse and his regime. The culminating point of this posture: his declaration of March 4, 2003, in which he called for a “holy war against the United States, the diabolic invaders”, and a Jihad which would oppose “the righteous against the liars, the virtuous against the vicious, the honest against the traitors, the warriors of Jihad against the mercenaries and aggressors.” (7)

Islamism: the most effective of the “anti-imperialist” and revolutionary ideologies

From the outset, one asks oneself what could be able to unify movements as ideologically antagonistic as the Reds (atheists and materialists), the Greens (theocrats and Islamists), and the Browns (believers in the war of the races). To believe that such an alliance would be philosophically impossible and strategically improbable—and, therefore, from the get-go doomed to checkmate—would be to forget that Islamism is not only the third totalitarianism to come about, but is also equally, in a number of points, the inherited unifier of the two predecessors. Insofar as Islamism is not only simply a religious “fundamentalism”, but also and above all a subversive revolutionary totalitarianism, an ideology of mass destruction comparable to Nazism, Maoism or Stalinism, this “Green fascism” prolongs the anterior totalitarianisms. What distinguishes the Green version essentially is that it brings to the historical totalitarian hatreds a theological justification

and a divine benediction.

Whether it concerns the Lebanese Hezbollah, Palestinian Hamas, the al Qaeda combatants, or the Iraqi and Palestinian “resisters”, it must be recognized that in the marketplace of global revolution, the Islamists and the Arab-Muslim “mujahideen” in general are the most effective and ferocious adversaries of “Israeli-American imperialism”. They are the ones who are inflicting the most damage on the “colonialist” and “capitalist” powers—whom the Reds and the Browns detest above all.

Being the third moment of totalitarianism, an avenging Islamism leading the assault on the capitalist democracies and the “Judeo-Crusader forces” knows now such an ascension throughout all corners of the globe and, in particular, in Europe—an ascension facilitated by the planetary and unprecedented mediatisation which it has enjoyed since the shock of September 11—that it has been attracting, like a magnet, the attentions of those nostalgic for the communist and Nazi totalitarianisms. Drawing at the same time from the vulgate of the extreme right and from an “Islamically correct” template that is pro-Arab and Third Worldist, this new revolutionary and planetary hatred henceforth seduces the latest anti-Jewish and anti-American militants of the extreme radical right.

From the crooked cross to the Crescent

The majority of the extreme right is clearly turned towards the Arab-Muslim world, conforming itself to the desire expressed by Hitler himself in his testament, in the name of the principle: “rather Islamic than Judeo-Mason” (8). It is therefore at the same time through fidelity to the Führer and by virtue of post-Cold War geopolitics, marked by the return of the civilizational paradigm, that the new extreme right, once viscerally pro-Western and anti-Communist, has tactically exchanged its Atlanticism for a “Third Worldism tinged with anti-Americanism and anti-Zionism” (9). This orientation gravitates naturally to the support of revolutionary Islamism. It is undeniable that the discourse of Alain de Benoist—leader of the *Groupe de Réflexion et d'Études sur la Civilisation Européenne* (GRECE), one of the more influential think-tanks of the pro-Islamist European extreme right—recalls strangely the rhetoric of the Italian Red Brigades (who have moreover always maintained bridges with the Browns (10)), underscoring an obsessive anti-Americanism that would not surprise the extreme left: “The military-industrial American complex, of which George W. Bush, that sociopath and notorious retard, is today the mouthpiece, has unilaterally mobilized against the nation and people of Iraq a war so dastardly and monstrous that nothing—save his will dominate the world—justifies it. Beginning this Tuesday, March 20, every act of reprisal in the world aimed against American interests as well as American military, political, diplomatic and administrative personnel, wherever it occurs, in whatever scope it represents, by whatever means and circumstances, is both legitimate and necessary.” (11)

Speaking of strange politics, the denunciation of “imperialist” American wars against Iraq has become, since 1990, one of the leitmotifs of the anti-Zionist extreme right, in this position becoming linked with organizations of the extreme left. The Iraq of Saddam Hussein had, it is true, much about it to please the partisans of the three totalitarianisms: not only had this regime nearly realized a synthesis of the national-Bolshevik with the national-Socialist, but it found itself, moreover, at the point of war against the two demons fought in common by the Reds, the Browns and the Greens: Israel and the United States. The ideological pro-Iraqi line which almost all of the extreme right in Europe adopted has been shown by a series of demonstrations denouncing “American imperialism”, as well as by voyages of solidarity to Baghdad. The capture of the dictator profoundly deceived those who were opposed to the American intervention. His arrest, in effect, came [at the time] to contradict their thesis, repeated ad nauseam, of the “American quagmire” in Iraq.

For the extreme right, the Age of Gold of the Brown-Green Axis harks back to the Second World War which saw an alliance between the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and Hitler, then the establishment of pro-Nazi Arab and Balkan legions (Waffen SS composed of Croatian-Bosnian-Albanian Muslims along with Egyptian green-shirts, etc.). With reference to the Palestinian Muslim Brotherhood, the Grand Mufti, Al Hajj Al Hussein, was at the origin, in 1942, of the creation of the Arab League, destined to pursue, alongside the forces of the Axis, the war against the Jews installed in Palestine. It is moreover in reference to the Grand Mufti that the English neo-Nazi leader David Myatt explains his conversion to Islam and his rallying to the cause of al Qaeda, recalling how “60,000 Muslims responded to the appeal of the Grand Mufti to join forces alongside Hitler.” (13)

Three great historical figures of the alliance between the Swastika and the Crescent continue, to this day, to saturate the minds of those nostalgic for the Axis: Leon Degrelle, the leader of Rexist—a collaborationist Belgian movement—and a great crafter of

rapprochement between Palestinian organizations and the neo-Nazi milieus between the years of 1950 to 1980; the famous Swiss banker François Genoud, testamentary legatee of Hitler and Goebbels, who consecrated the bulk of his post-Nazi life to financing terrorist and nationalist Arab movements (Nasserism, the Palestinian FPLP and OLP, the Algerian FLN, the Muslim Brotherhood, etc.) in their capacity as enemies of the Jews; and, finally, one of the major artisans of the “Islamonazi synthesis,” Johann Von Leers (14), Goebbel's old right arm, responsible for anti-Semitic propaganda under the Third Reich. Become Omar Amin after having been recruited in Egypt by Nasser, who nominated him responsible for anti-Jewish propaganda in Cairo, Von Leers converted to Islam after his contact with the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. His example continues to inspire an Islamophile and pro-Arab current of the extreme right. It is in his memory that one of the actual ringleaders of the new pro-Islamist European right, the Italian Claudio Mutti, has chosen for his name of conversion to Islam that of Omar Amin. Today still, these three symbols of Islamo-Nazi flirtation are referenced by young neo-Nazi militants who look in the Brown-Green alliance toward the “sole chance of survival for an Aryan Europe” in the face of the danger represented by the “Western plutocracies” and by the “Judeo-Mason conspiracy”.

It is equally in memory of the Islamo-Nazi synthesis of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem that European or American neo-Nazi groups salute the anti-Jewish action of Hezbollah or Hamas and the warrior force of bin Laden. Thus, in the May-June 2002 issue of their review, *Jusqu'à nouvel Ordre*, the militants of GUD—who regularly visit Tripoli and Damas by the invitation of the revisionist General Mustapha Tlass, Minister of Defense and local editor of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*—boast of the alliance between the Crescent and the Swastika since the epoch of the Grand Mufti up to today. Islamism and Nazism—which, let us not forget, refers itself to German paganism—commune together in fact under the same detestation of the Judeo-Christian heritage of the West. “Our enemies consist of the imperialist American-Zionist coalition. It is therefore just that we support those who have the same enemies as us, namely, the Palestinians and the Iraqi and Libyan governments. The Islamists represent a multiform force able to be an ally against American-Zionist imperialism” (15), explains one of the ideologues of this movement, Christian Bouchet, the redactor-in-chief of *Lutte du Peuple*, a review which expresses its solidarity as much with the “martyrs” of the Third Reich as with those of the Islamic Jihad and Hamas. “Europe and Islam have in common their principal enemy..., the usurocratic Finance. If she wishes to recover her autonomy, Europe ought to look for her inspiration and guide in the divine Law, that which has been conserved in the book of Allah” (16), says the fascist Italian convert to Islam Claudio Mutti, alias Omar Amin. While another thinker of the new European Right, Arnaud Galtieri (disciple of the philosopher of the extreme right converted to Islam, René Guénon), clearly states: “Let us assist the ongoing progression of the only force capable of resisting the Western hegemony: radical Islamism. Two visions of the world confront each other. One must choose sides. On one side, a liberal-consumerist vision... On the other, a religious, traditionalist and holistic vision: Islam... There is therefore a real Jihad to which Europeans and Muslims are invited. Europe-Islam, the one and the same fight” (17).

Proof of the European and trans-national dimension of the new pro-Islamist dimension of the extreme right (18) is in London, where one of the principal centers of Islamist proselytism, the Islamic Council of Defense of Europe, is based. This institution is animated by old neo-Nazi militants. At its head, one finds Tahir de la Nive, a Franco-British convert to Islam who, imitating David Myatt, extols the general Islamization of Europe as the sole “remedy for decadence and American-Zionist imperialism” (19). Quite respected among the “national-revolutionary” milieus, among skinheads and in the heart of the New Right, Mr. de la Nive, an old mujahid who had gone off to fight the Soviet “infidels” in the 1980s, advocates a kind of “European Islamic nationalism” and publishes a bilingual French-English review, *Centurio*, which “treats of the military problems in the framework of Islamic philosophy and war”. In a recent work prefaced by Omar Amin and Christian Bouchet, *Les Croisés de l'Oncle Sam* [*The Crusades of Uncle Sam*], this Brown-Green ideologue calls on all neo-Nazi militants to join revolutionary Islam and denounce every form of compromise with the “diabolic” forces of American-Israeli imperialism. Other central figures of English fascism, the directors of the World Union of Socialists—Colin Jordan, the “Führer” of the English National Socialist Movement (NSM), and John Tyndall—have since 1988 been maintaining contacts with Palestinian terrorist milieus as well as with the regime of Muammar Kadhafy. On his side, the head of the English Nationalist Movement, Troy Southgate, has declared in the columns of the Franco-English national-revolutionary journal *W.O.T.A.N.* (Will of the Aryan Nations): “In Palestine, the cruelty of Zionism is evident and we cannot but sympathize with the Palestinian people who, just as ourselves, have seen their land soiled and despoiled by the ignoble parasite

which is international Jewry. The ENM salutes Hamas and totally supports the armed struggle against those who have viciously attacked the ancestral heritage of an entire nation” (20).

The cases of European fascist militants converted to Islam and allied with terrorist organization are numerous. Besides David Myatt and Tahir de la Nive in the United Kingdom, who have put their martial experience in the service of the Jihad (21), one can cite the case of Alessandro Karim Abdul Ghé (22), a veteran of the group *Ordine Nuovo*—the Italian fascist equivalent of the *Ordre Nouveau* in France—responsible for many attacks in Italy between 1969 and 1973. A disciple of the fascist leader Franco Fredda, Karim Abdul Ghé is a shareholder of Al Taqwa, an Islamist holding company based in Lugano and accused after September 11 by the American State Department of having financed bin Laden's organization. Other shareholders and council members of the administration of Al Taqwa: the Italian convert Sante Cicarello, director of the Union of Italian Islamic Communities, and Ahmed Huber. This Swiss neo-Nazi ex-journalist converted to Islam is one of the most active partisans of the Brown-Green rapprochement. Huber has visited Teheran numerous times during the time of the Ayatollah Khomeini, and he has maintained very good relations with the Iranian government (a number of Nazis saw in the Iranians the descendants of the ancient “Aryans”). His cassettes and political discourses have been disseminated and sold on the Internet, notably on Brown-Green sites such as *Radio Islam* or *Aaargh*.

The Red and the Green

The alliance between radical Islamism and the extreme left, on its part, was set in place around the Third Worldist and revolutionary project of the Tricontinental and in the support for the “Palestinian resistance” during the years 1970-80. In the context of the Cold War and, above all, from the time of the accession of Andropov as head of the USSR, the aim of the Tricontinental was to unite, around the Soviet Union, the Marxist revolutionary forces and all anti-Western tendencies and forces of the Third World, particularly those of the Arab world. This new East-South cooperation, via Cuba, would be the raw material of the Islamo-Marxist alliance, which did not cease to augment itself up to the time of the launching of the Al Aqsa Intifada, the American operation in Afghanistan, and the second Gulf War—key moments in the reactivation of the Red-Green Axis.

From a doctrinal point of view, it is true that Islamism and Communism partake of the same conquering universalism and the same “messianism for the poor”: “Bolshevism combines the characteristics of the French Revolution with those of the rise of Islam. Islam and Bolshevism have a practical, social and material telos whose sole goal is to extend their domination over the world”, wrote Bertrand Russell (23). The Golden Age of the Islamo-Leftist alliance would be incarnated by the Palestinian training camps of Libya (Bir Hassan, Tall al Zaatar, etc., in which volunteers from among the “Damnés” [the Palestinian “victims” of Israeli “occupation”] from the Left Bank instruct future Islamists of the Amal movement and Iranian revolutionaries), and by the Islamic Iranian revolution, saluted at one time by the entire Western Left. The Red-Green flirtation was, in effect, particularly stimulated at the debut of that revolution of the Mullahs: it was the Imam Ali Shariati—translator of the revolutionary ideologue Frantz Fanon, admired by Jean Paul Sartre—who brought to Khomeini in 1978 a Socialist-Islamist synthesis from which would arise the symbolic victory of the Ayatollah: he would be, in effect, supported in his enterprise by the Iranian extreme left. It is also due to Shariati that the Fanonian idea of “the oppressed” became Islamicized into *mustadhafines* (the “disinherited”). The Feddayins of the people, by inspiration Guevarist as Mujahideens of the people—a radical movement explicitly “Islam-Marxist” whose members, persecuted in Iran, found refuge in Saddam Hussein's Iraq—were inspired by these ideas.

The Red-Green convergences explain why intellectuals of such renown as the philosophers Michel Foucault, Simone de Beauvoir, or Jean-Paul Sartre had wished to see in the Islamic revolution of Khomeini a “divine surprise which reminds us of something that the West has forgotten, namely, the possibility of a political spirituality” (Foucault, *Corriere della sera*, October 1978). Jacques Madaule described the Khomeinist revolution as “a clamor come from the depths of time from a people who refuse once and for all servitude and the chains that a stranger puts on them.” From the conversion of the ex-Marxist Roger Garaudy, to the new Islamist revolutionary struggle proposed by Carlos, the Islamo-Communist links are many, with (as in the case of the bond between Islamism and the extreme right) the hyphenated anti-Zionism and anti-Americanism.

Coupled with the media-saturated Israeli-Palestinian conflict—to the detriment of so many other conflicts in the world—, this anti-American and anti-Zionist attitude, to which

the Anglo-American war against Saddam and the American support for Sharon have given a new vigor, found itself at the origin of a new surge of anti-Western radicalism which tends to justify the terrorist option in the face of “American imperialism” or against “Israeli fascism”. In the name of the syllogism according to which America and Israel incarnate “absolute Evil” of which the Arab-Muslim peoples of the Third World are “essential victims”, it is at last the anti-Western and anti-Zionist Islamism which appears, in the eyes of the Red champions of the Palestinian and Third Worldist causes, to be like a new “anti-imperialist path” par excellence. Whence the appeal by certain of their number to support the Taliban, the Hezbollah or al Qaeda, an appeal relayed by a number of revolutionary and terrorist groups of the extreme left: from the Japanese Red Army (which has known more and more converts to Islam) to the Red Brigades of Italy by way of the nebula of Carlos. In his recent publication of interviews, the famous pro-Palestinian terrorist explains that “Islam has acquired an irreversible political and revolutionary dimension which, since the dissolution of the Socialist camp, has become the principal force of active transformation for societies and for the anti-imperialist struggle” (24). Already, a little after the anti-American attacks perpetrated in 1998 by al Qaeda in Africa, Ilich Ramirez Sanchez [aka Carlos the Jackal] declared in the journal *Jeune Afrique* : “The imperialist aggression tries to suppress the expansion of Islam... by attacking Osama bin Laden and trying to decapitate the Wahhabi renewal. But this is at the point of sweeping away the usurpers of Nejd and of the Hejaz and liberating the Holy Places... and Palestine . The attacks [of al Qaeda] are in historical continuity with our own, commenced a quarter of a century ago on earth, sea and in the air against the Zionists” (25).

As far as the Italian Red Brigades, re-appearing in these latter years on the other side of the Alps under the names of *Parti Communiste Combattant* (BR-PCC) and *Nuclei Territoriali Anti-imperialisti* (NTA), they have equally created some surprise in appealing to revolutionaries of the entire world to join Islamist terrorism, saluting “the heroic action of al Qaeda against American imperialism”. In a document of March of 2003 which claims responsibility for the assassination of the advisor to the Minister of Labor Massimo D'Antona, Nadia Desdemona Lioce, one of the brains of the organization, invites in the purest Marxist style the “Arab and Islamic masses who are expropriated and humiliated, natural allies of the metropolitan proletarian” to “take up arms at the heart of a unique and international axis at the side of the anti-imperialist *Front Combattant* in the face of a new offensive by bourgeois governments” (26). Desdemone Lioce goes on to draw “politico-military” conclusions from “the Zionist-American aggression against Iraq ” (27) in which she sees “an imperialist will to cut down the principal obstacle to the Zionist hegemony” and “to annihilate the Palestinian resistance”. Since they have taken the part of the Taliban and al Qaeda, the Red Brigades have not ceased to show solidarity with the fundamentalists of Islam while, during the war against the regime of Saddam, they have appealed to “counter by all means the Israeli-Anglo-American aims”. In France , after the dismantling of the Chalabi network in 1995—one of the most important Islamist Algerian networks in the Parisian region—, it was already discovered that one of the instructors of the group, Rémy Pouthon, alias “Youssef”, was a veteran of the Italian Red Brigades converted to the Salafist Islam of the GIA.

From the Reds-Greens to the Anti-Globalists

Although the principal parties of the great anti-globalist organizations have often denounced Islamist fundamentalism, pro-Islamist opinions are currently more and more often expressed in the midst of the Trotskyite nebula. Example: the position defended by Luiza Toscano, commentator for Comité concerning liberties and human rights in Tunisia, who explains, in *Rouge* , the weekly of the LCR, that “one should not vainly condemn Islam, since Islamism contests the domination of the North on the military, cultural and ideological levels” (28). The Socialism movement at bottom is, for its part, clearly partisan for the Islamist option. In his text *The Prophet and the Proletariat*, Chris Harman, director of the English parent-establishment of that network, the Socialist Workers' Party, tries to absolve the “mass Islamist movements in Algeria or in Egypt”, arguing that they are not “mainly directed against workers' organizations and do not offer their services to the dominant portions of capital” (29).

Since the first Gulf War, the denunciation of George W. Bush's campaign against the “Axis of Evil”, coupled with the “martyr” theme of the Palestinians, has become one of the principal pivots around which turns the Red-Brown-Green Axis. Already, in 2001, in Paris, after the anti-American demonstrations provoked by the anti-terrorist operation in Afghanistan, the militants of the extreme left expressed their rejection of “American imperialism” in stressing “Neither Bush nor Sharon”. Since the instigation of the second Al

Aqsa Intifada in 2000, Western Europe has passively assisted in the erection of a new form of re-Islamicized anti-Semitism, under cover of anti-Zionism and the struggle against the “Zionist racism and fascism of Sharon” (30). Thus it is that the disquieting spectacle of young Muslims fanaticized against Israel and the Jews, publicly crying out “Death to Jews” during “anti-Zionist” demonstrations at the side of pro-Palestinian organizations of the extreme left, has now become banal (31). Similar appeals to murder reappeared during the entire winter of 2002-2003 at the time of demonstrations “for peace in Iraq”, punctuated by pro-Palestinian slogans emphasized by participants holding up portraits of Saddam Hussein, flags of Hezbollah, and even tee-shirts sporting the effigy of bin Laden.

The demonstrations of anti-American and anti-Israeli hate organized by the “No Global” people connect often with those of the Trotskyite movements and of the extreme left—organizations with which the anti-Globalist nebula remains structurally linked. They converge in the same Americanophobic and Israelophobic radicalism expressed in a recurrent fashion by media personalities like José Bové, the vandalizer of McDonald's and smasher of the American “malbouffe”, or again the Portuguese Nobel prize-winner in literature, José Saramago, the American economist Jeremy Rifkin, the Egyptian economist Samir Amin, and the Canadian writer Naomi Klein, whose work *No Logo* constitutes one of the reference texts of the movement.

The anti-Globalist movement is composed of many different tendencies which in general invokes the radical left. One there finds as much the Brazilian “*sem-terra*” João Pedro Stedile as the American linguist Noam Chomsky or even the American “primitivist” John Zerzan. Four grand tendencies can be distinguished at the heart of the *No Globals* :

- anarchists, the “homeless”, the “landless”, and the “indigenists”, all of whom often refer themselves to the emblematic figure of the Zapatista “subcommandant” Marcos;
- the ONG ecologists or “environmentalists” (Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, World Wide Foundation), and the associations of the struggle against financial speculation (such as ATTAC, an outgrowth, among other reviews and syndicates of the extreme left, of the *Monde Diplomatique*);
- the progressive religious milieus inspired by the Liberation Theology of Leonardo Boff and Frei Betto, as well as the anti-Zionist Catholic movements represented by *Emmaüs* (the organization of the Abbot Pierre) or the journal *Témoignage Chrétien* ;
- the Trotskyite organizations and the libertarians of the extreme left. Thus the explanation for the fact that Toni Negri, ex-ideologue of the Red Brigades, is one of the leaders of *No Global* .

After the counter-summits of Seattle, Göteborg and Davos, it was at Genoa in July of 2001 that the anti-Globalist movement benefited from the most intense mobilization, the right-wing government formed by Silvio Berlusconi in March 2001 having been chosen as a kind of privileged target because of his pro-Americanism and the alliance of Berlusconi's party, *Forza Italia* , with the National Alliance of Gianfranco Fini. In December of 2002 the European Social Forum (FSE) of Florence succeeded in putting on an imposing anti-American demonstration “for peace” to which were joined the majority of extreme left organizations, from the Italian General Confederation to the powerful *Legambiente* . Everywhere the effigy of Che Guevara was brandished, that symbol of armed struggle in 1960, who had now become, astonishingly, transformed into a “hero of Peace”. A similar alliance could be seen on the side of the Greek Social Forum, formed in 2002 and present at the Florence Forum. There, it was on the side of the Left Coalition and of Progress (*Synaspimos*), inheritor of a schism of the Communist Party (KKE), by which the Greek anti-Globalists have reunified, in the context of a grand union of anti-Americanism, the various protesting movements issuing as much from the “anti-racist”, feminist and ecologist ranks as from the syndical front *Pame* . More recently, it has been the Egypto-Swiss Islamist Tariq Ramadan, charismatic figure of the Muslim Brotherhood in Europe , who has attempted an entry into the interior of the European No Global movement (32).

Negationism, anti-Americanism and anti-Zionism: the three pivots of the European Red-Brown-Green Axis

Certainly, at the start, these two paradoxical alliances—Red-Green and Brown-Green—were totally independent. But they have ended by evolving toward a Red-Brown-Green triptych which associates two transversal questions: Palestinianism and Negationism. By itself, this current of radical thought—which consists in delegitimizing the state of Israel and accusing the “Zionists” of having invented the gas chambers in order to accelerate the creation of the Jewish State—incarnates the Red-Brown-Green Axis and assembles the most diverse protagonists. It was initiated in the 1950s in Egypt by the neo-

Muslim nazi dignitary Johann von Leers, then passed on to France by the neo-fascist review of Maurice Bardèche, *Défense de l'Occident* (33), and then revamped throughout Europe (particularly in France and in Italy) by the Trotskyite and Maoist ultra-left (*Vieille Taupe* in France, and the Bordighist movement in Italy)—the aim being, for the leftists, to move anti-fascism to the background in order to be able to concentrate their attacks on the “capitalist bourgeois State” and “American imperialism”.

The negationist theses would be recuperated by the extreme right during the years 1980-90 and, finally, by the radical Islamist nebula, always in the name of the sacrosanct Palestinian cause. The French revisionist editor Pierre Guillaume, one of the figures of the Brown-Green rapprochement, who boasts to have maintained cordial relations with Carlos, has not ceased to cement the bonds with radical Islamist milieus. Incarcerated in the *prison de la Santé* in Paris, where Guillaume has given him access to his review, the South American terrorist has moreover congratulated the editor for his “anti-Zionist” activism. The long friendship which bound Carlos to the Nazi banker François Genoud will also be recalled (34).

The central role of Roger Garaudy

In Sweden, the Red-Brown-Green alliance is incarnated by the organization of the Moroccan Islamist opponent, Ahmed Rami, president of the Swedish Islamic Union. Director of studies of the Islamist-Negationist connection in Europe, Ahmed Rami has published the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and has developed the idea according to which “Islam finds itself actually on the front line of the resistance against the Jewish domination and can today supply responses to the problems posed by the bankruptcy of the Western Jewish hegemony” (35). On Rami's website, *Radio Islam*, the revisionists Serge Thion and Robert Faurisson hold regular forums in which they eulogize the terrorist group Islamic Jihad. Ahmed Rami collaborates equally with Ernest Zündel (36), the ringleader of the neo-Nazi negationist movement in Canada, as well as with the revisionist Ditlieb Felderer in Sweden, member of Congress in Malmö (37). In rhetoric borrowed from the extreme left, Rami explains that “the West has no interest in supporting Israel, which constitutes the last archaic colonialism and the last apartheid. The unnatural support of the West for Israel is proof of the illegitimate power of the Zionist mafia which decides the domestic and foreign policies of all the Western nations” (38). And Rami cites Roger (“Rajah”) Garaudy as a supreme reference of the “Western resistance”. This famous ex-Communist philosopher and convert to Islam since the 1980s has enjoyed a considerable role in the Red-Brown-Green rapprochement.

His negationist, anti-Zionist and Americanophobic writings have united personalities as initially opposed as the revisionists Serge Thion and Robert Faurisson (from the ranks of the extreme left before being rehabilitated by the extreme right and the Islamists), the “National-Bolshevik” militants as well as neo-Nazis and radical anti-Zionists of the Trotskyite, Maoist and Bordighist ultra-left (39). A recent leading figure of negationism, Garaudy, director of an organization called *Retour à l'islam*, has received enthusiastic support in the Arab-Muslim world (which has also been the case with other negationists, such as Robert Faurisson (40)). Banned in numerous Western countries, his work *Les Mythes fondateurs de la politique israélienne* is disseminated all over Muslim lands: with hundreds of thousands of copies sold, *Les Mythes fondateurs* is a best-seller in the Arab world. Not surprising, from this, is that Garaudy had been received as a hero at the International Book Fair of Cairo on February 15, 1998. He profited from this occasion to denounce before hundreds of intellectuals “the Zionist power that controls 95% of Western media” (41). During his trial in February of 1998 (at the conclusion of which he was condemned to nine months of prison with deferment and a fine of 160,000 francs for dispute of crimes against humanity and racial defamation) he received the support not only of militants from the extreme left and neo-Nazi activist revisionists, but also from dozens of Islamist and Arab intellectuals and journalists. Iranian clerics became indignant that one could simultaneously drag the “poor Muslim philosopher Roger Garaudy” to justice and protest against the fatwa directed against the author of the *Satanic Verses* (42). The syndicate of Egyptian journalists officially took over the defense of Garaudy in declaring that he was being “judged according to an anti-democratic law [the Gayssot law] which interdicts the liberty of research on certain aspects of the history of the Second World War” (43). From the most secular Muslim countries to the most fundamentalist Islamic republics or monarchies, the craze for the negationist theses of Garaudy—which go to reinforce the pro-Palestinian propaganda in full radicalized form—is immense. Recipient in 1985 of the Islamic Faycal Prize awarded by the Saudi king in gratitude for his efforts in favor of Islam, Garaudy was enthroned as the new herald of the anti-Zionist cause (44). A communist

philosopher become Muslim and adulated by the extreme right, Roger Garaudy embodies the revisionist pivot around which converge the three totalitarianisms, Red, Brown and Green, in the name of identical detestations and obsessive hatreds. It is a neo-totalitarian convergence all the more disquieting because of the moral, philosophical and even ecclesiastical blessings given Garaudy by such “progressive authorities” as Noam Chomsky, the Abbot Pierre, José Bové, or Tariq Ramadan: all these personalities have defended the author of *Les Mythes fondateurs*, each in his fashion, in samizdats, colloquiums, Internet sites, appeals of support, defense committees, etc.

The Russian case: an uninhibited Red-Brown-Green alliance

In Russia, one of the principal Islamist movements, the Party of Islamic Renaissance (PRI) of Gueïdar Djemal, draw equally close to revisionist, ultra-nationalist, anti-American and anti-Zionist milieus that qualify themselves as “Browns-Reds”: its concern is principally the movement of Edouard Limonov (45), ringleader of the National-Bolshevik Party, as well as the Front of Russian Salvation (Sobor), a “national-communist bloc” reuniting ultra-nationalists of the extreme right and those nostalgic for Soviet communism whose representative is general Alexandre Sterligov. This explains how it is that Gueïdar Djemal, while being a public radical Islamist, has at his disposal a regular platform in the columns of the ultra-nationalist Russian journal *Zavtra*, himself influenced by Eurasian and national-Bolshevik theses (46)... An essential component of the Red-Brown-Green puzzle: the neo-communists, ultra-nationalists and anti-Westerners of Guennadi Ziouganov, the head of PC who claims expertise in geopolitics and does not hesitate to propose an alliance with radical Islamism (47). The Eurasian school, adhered to by Djemal, Ziouganov and other “Red-Brown” Russians, considers that “fundamentalist Islam, with its anti-materialism, its rejection of the banking system, of international usury and of the system of the liberal economy, is an ally. The sole geopolitical enemies of the Russians and the Muslims is the United States and its liberal, cosmopolitan, anti-religious, anti-traditional system” (48)—so writes one of the ideologues of this movement, the geopolitician Alexander Douguine (49), president of the movement *Evracija* and of the *Association of Geopolitical Studies*, and who edits the review *Elementy*, modeled after that of the European New Right of Alain de Benoist, *Eléments*. In the fashion of Nazi ideologues Claudio Mutti or David Myatt, Geïdar Djemal explains that Islam is the only solution which would permit Russia “to arrest the process of national decadence provoked by Western imperialism”.

Ferociously anti-Zionist and anti-Semitic, Gueïdar Djemal salutes Hezbollah, Hamas, the Japanese Red Army, the IRA, Direct Action and Carlos—“not any compromise” being according to him possible with the “terrorist” state of Israel. For him, “the Holocaust was nothing but a weapon used by the world order seeking to crush the only real opposition to Zionism, that is Islam” (50). It is by this same perspective that on November 2, 2001 there was organized on Pushkin Square in Moscow a “Russo-Islamic Green-Red” demonstration against the bombing of Afghanistan by the United States. Among the political forces present: the Movement of the Russian Left (Marxist-Leninist, anti-American and Third Worldist), the “anti-Globalists” of Boris Kagarlitsky, the national-Bolshevist, and the PRI of Djemal. With cries of “don't touch Islam!”, the protestors saluted the presence of the Mufti Nagigoula Achirov, head of the Spiritual Direction (DSM) of Asiatic Russia, as well as that of the Mufti of the Muslims of Orenburg, Islamïl Shangariëv. In his discourse, Gueïdar Djemal recalls that the Ayatollah Khomeini had overturned the Shah of Iran thanks to the alliance between the Shiite Islamists and the Communists, that Hezbollah was allied with FDLP in the face of the “Israeli metastases”, and that a number of Taliban leaders had once, long ago, belonged to Marxist military units. And naturally, during the winter of 2002-2003, the Red-Brown-Green Russians organized other anti-American demonstrations in the course of which “Zionist traditionalists” such as Paul Wolfowitz were accused of being responsible for the “criminal” politics conducted by George W. Bush.

A rhetoric in the process of banalization

In that which concerns the extreme right, its anti-American and pro-Arab position has been adopted with a double goal: to enlarge its numbers by appearing to be “anti-racist”—because pro-Arab—all the while recycling anti-Semitism (always an electoral persuader) not through an explicit Judeophobic rhetoric but rather via a wholly progressive “solidarity” with regard to the Arab-Muslim “victims” of the “intrigues of the Jews”.

As far as the parties of the extreme left, the anti-Globalist movements, and the anti-imperialist left in general, they seemed to have exchanged their traditional militant anti-clericalism and atheism for a pro-Islamic communitarianism which betrays their wish to gain new “proletarian” and “disinherited” electorates coming from the Third World, at a

period in time when orthodox Marxism, defeated by History, has less appeal. This reorientation is favored by the global geopolitical context which reveals Arab nationalism—once allied with the USSR—to be rehabilitated by a trans-national revolutionary Islamism (which is only but an Islamicized version of the Marxist revolutionary Internationalism). Once again, the terrorist and Marxist-revolutionary ideologue par excellence, Carlos, expresses perfectly this mutation: “Osama bin Laden, in standing up to the imperialist Yankees, has become the hero of all the oppressed, whether they be Muslims or not (...) Today, a new internationalism becomes the obligation of all men, powerfully unifying, which fuses the moral ideal and the sacred dimension with the conceptual and theoretical architecture of the social revolutionary movement (...)” (51).

The two Anglo-American wars against the regime of Saddam; the politics pursued by Ariel Sharon with the support of Washington; the vast operation of reprisals following September 11 and ending with the defeat of the Taliban: these different episodes of the post-Cold War era have not ceased to crystallize the anti-American and “revolutionary” resentments of every stripe, from the “anti-imperialists” of the extreme left to the anti-Zionists of the extreme right, by way of the indefinable “No Globals”, attackers of “American unilateralism”. Astonishingly, the anti-American and anti-war mobilization had been much less rallied after the war in Kosovo, the 1999 operation perhaps comparable in many respects with the anti-Saddam operation of 2003. In France for example, only the extreme right, the extreme left, the sovereigntists, independent intellectuals, and some ultra-pacifists had criticized the intervention of the NATO conducted without the endorsement of the UN; as far as the masses of youths and moderate parties, they remained mute, if they did not frankly taken a position in favor of the war. In the light of our overall adumbration which brings in relief the particular force of attraction of the disputes founded on Islamic legitimacy and Arab-Palestinian victimology, it is not surprising that Afghani, Iraqi and Palestinian victims of the American and Israeli Satans stir up more compassion than do the Yugoslavian victims of Washingtonian diplomacy. The Serbs—in contrast with the Bosnian Muslims—are much too similar to Western Judeo-Christians to excite the compassion of the new Third Worldists.

The occasion of an unhoped-for victory for the Reds, the Browns and the Greens, the Iraqi crisis has allowed for regilding the blazon of the most bellicose anti-Zionist and anti-American postures, to democratize and even to render respectable the most extreme positions. It has restored, directly or indirectly, a new popular and media legitimacy to old totalitarian rancours. One can also take seriously the bill of health issued from his prison cell by Ilich Ramirez Sanchez: the ideal anti-imperialist revolutionary is not dead. Beyond even the Red-Brown-Green totalitarian mergers, it penetrates now the arena, once recalcitrant, of the politically correct and the traditional-minded. The most outrageous anti-Westernism is now banalized, tolerated, even often accepted from the moment it devolves rhetorically into defensive anti-Americanism and anti-Zionism. If any proof be wanting, we had the declarations not too long ago of the Malaysian leader Mahathir Mohamad—however much a reputed enemy of the Islamists—in which he expressed his desire for a kind of anti-Western Islamic revolution and denounced the “global Judeo-Masonic conspiracy”; and here's the shocking manifestation of the banalization I have been referring to: certain Western heads of state present at the time of that Summit of the OCI [Organization of the Islamic Conference] of Putrajaya of October 19, 2003, did not even think to be indignant (52)!

A veritable geopolitical and civilizational bomb that runs the risk of setting the world on fire and invigorating the clash of civilizations between Islam and the West which the Reds, the Browns and the Greens look forward to in order to achieve their respective revolutions, Iraq has become the latest destination of the Jihad of the Islamists of the entire world (veterans of Afghanistan, Chechnya, Bosnia, Arab mujahideens, etc.). More than ever, Westerners ought to show themselves determined and unified to stand up to the new offensive of al Qaeda and to re-establish peace and stability as much in Iraq as in the occupied territories (for “the road to Baghdad passes through Jerusalem”, according to an Arab saying).

The terrible anti-Jewish and anti-British attacks perpetrated in Istanbul on November 15 and 20 of 2003 served as bloody warnings to the West: the recent doubling back of assaults by al Qaeda towards Iraq—a frontier of Turkey, itself a candidate for entry in the European Union—signifies that the Islamist terrorists seek to besiege the soft Mediterranean underbelly and to profit from the receptivity to their propaganda of a re-Islamicized Turkey. The Europeans can no longer permit themselves to conduct the policy of the ostrich: the danger has never been so urgent.

6 Dec. 2004. Rather poorly translated from the French by Erich von Abele.

- (1) See his book of interviews: *Carlos, L'Islam révolutionnaire* [*Revolutionary Islam*], *textes et propos présentés par Jean Michel Vernochet*, Éditions du Rocher, Paris, 2003.
- (2) *Carlos*, op. cit., p. 96.
- (3) Alain Gresh, Tariq Ramadan, *L'Islam en questions*, Sindbad-Actes Sud, 2000, p. 29.
- (4) *Carlos*, in Jean Michel Vernochet, op. cit., p. 91.
- (5) See the webpage of David Myatt: <http://www.geocities.com/davidmyatt/>
- (6) Amardeep Bassey, "Midland Nazi turns to Islam", February 16, 2003, IC Birmingham. Icnetwork.
- (7) *Le Monde*, March 6, 2003.
- (8) Adolf Hitler declared in his "Testament", reported by Martin Bormann: "All of Islam vibrates at the announcement of our victories. [...] What can we do to help them [...], how can it be to our interest and our duty? The presence next to us of the Italians [...] creates a malaise among our friends of Islam, [...] it hinders us from playing one of our better cards: to support the countries oppressed by the British. Such a policy would excite enthusiasm throughout Islam. It is, in effect, a particularity of the Muslim world that what touches one, whether good or ill, is felt by all the others. [...] The people ruled by Islam will always be nearer to us than France, in spite of the kinship of blood"... Testament of Hitler, Headquarters of the Führer, February 4 to April 2, 1945, preface by François Genoud.
- (9) Christophe Bourseiller, *La nouvelle extrême droite* [*The New Extreme Right*], Éditions du Rocher, p. III.
- (10) Christophe Bourseiller recalls that "one of the historical leaders of the terrorist movement the Italian Red Brigades, Renato Curcio, has started off his political career in the movement *Jeune Europe*", linked with GRECE. *The New Extreme Right*, op. cit., p. 115
- (11) Communication disseminated to members of GRECE by Alain de Benoist, president of this same group, on March 20, 2003.
- (12) Let us cite the voyage of members of the *Association SOS Enfants d'Irak*, directed by Jany Le Pen, wife of the president of the French National Front (February 2, 2003). This pilgrimage followed closely the one organized by the initiative of the *Association des amitiés franco-irakiennes*, directed by the radical sovereigntist writer Philippe de Saint-Robert and neo-fascist activist Gilles Munier (January 12, 2003). Entitled "a plane for Iraq", the operation was organized in cooperation with the *ONG Enfants du Monde*. Gilles Munier has promised the translation in France of the first "literary work" of Saddam Hussein, *Zoubeida et le roi* [*Zoubeida and the King*] (Éditions du Rocher). This veteran member of GRECE writes for *Nation européenne*, an organ of the nationalist-revolutionary movement *Jeune Europe*. It is this organization, with a neo-fascist tinge and violently anti-Israeli, which arose out of the first European militant to die in the ranks of the Fatah; and let us not forget the recurrent visits of the Austrian Jorg Haider to Baghdad. Let us also remark that other currents of the European extreme right made rendezvous in Baghdad in February of 2003, notably the old militants of GUD (*Groupe Union Défense*, a French neo-Nazi student movement); commentators of the Italian daily *Rinascita*, come there to demonstrate before the seat of the UN inspectors in Baghdad; the Spanish *Movimiento Social Republicano*; and even a radical French network (once called *Unité radicale*, a small group dissolved after the attack committed by one of its members, Maxime Brunerie, against Jacques Chirac on July 14, 2002). Denouncing in a chorus the "imperialist aggression in Iraq", these organizations tried to underscore "the important points of convergence between the Baathist ideology and revolutionary nationalism". See "Des soutiens d'extrême droite pour Saddam Hussein", *Actualité Juive*, February 13, 2003.
- (13) See the site of David Myatt: <http://www.geocities.com/davidmyatt/>
- (14) A member of the national-socialist party of the SS, protégé of Alfred Rosenberg, Johannes Von Leers became a personal friend of the Mufti of Jerusalem. Cf. Patrice Chairoff, *Dossier néo-nazisme*, Ramsay, 1977, p. 450.
- (15) Christian Bouchet, "Pourquoi avoir créé Unité Radicale", an article on the old site *d'Unité radicale*, now closed down.
- (16) *Il musulmano*, January-February 1994.
- (17) Cf. *Vouloir* (review of Belgian geopolitics with affinity to the New Right), *numéro spécial islam*, July 1992. René Guénon, a traditionalist philosopher converted to Islam, has been a major inspiration for converts and apologists of radical Islamism at the heart of the European extreme right.
- (18) See the work of Christophe Bourseiller, *La nouvelle extrême-droite*. Op. cit.
- (19) Cf. Alexandre del Valle, *Le Totalitarisme islamiste à l'assaut des démocraties*, Paris, Syrtès, 2003.
- (20) Troy Southgate, interview in English in the journal *W.O.T.A.N*, N°10, February 1997. See also W.O.T.A.N on the Internet : <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/2286>.
- (21) An expert in martial arts and commando operations, Myatt is the author of many terrorism manuals.
- (22) "Il ruolo del nazista Ahmed Huber", *Corriere della Sera*, November 25, 2001.
- (23) Bertrand Russell, *Theory and practice of Bolshevism*, London, 1979, pp., 5-29-114 [sic: as it appears in the French original].
- (24) *Carlos*, in Jean Michel Vernochet, op. cit., p. 92.
- (25) "Carlos : Les Américains, Ben Laden et moi", *Jeune Afrique*, N°1966, September 15-21, 1998.
- (26) Confessional communiqué of the assassination of Massimo D'Antona, March 22, 2003. Nadia Desdemona Lioce was arrested on March 2, 2003, after a shoot-out on the Rome-Florence train and wrote this text in prison.
- (27) *Ibid.*
- (28) *La Repubblica*, March 25, 2003.
- (29) Text cited in: "Extrême gauche et islamisme : du rejet à la compréhension" ["The extreme left and Islamism: from rejection to understanding"], *Actualité Juive*, February 13, 2003.
- (30) Cf. the work of Pierre-André Taguieff, *La nouvelle judéophobie*, 2002; Emmanuel Brenner, *Les territoires perdus de la République, Mille et une nuits*, 2002; Shmuel Trigano, *L'ébranlement d'Israël*, Seuil, 2002.
- (31) Cf. "Comment les jeunes beurs sont gagnés par la judéophobie" ["How young Muslim immigrants are won over by Judeophobia"], *Le Monde*, April 12, 2001.
- (32) Despite a polemic set in motion at the heart of the movement ATTAC, which steers the FSE, Ramadan has finally been integrated into the movement and animated, on the morning of November 15 at Évry, a round table of the European Social Forum dedicated to "Islamophobia".
- (33) Edited in France by Fallois.
- (34) In homage to the Muslim martyrs and the pagan neo-Nazi milieus, Carlos wrote to the latter, shortly before his death on March 18, 1995, from his prison cell at de la Santé in Paris: "If ever we see each other again, we will attain the Valhalla of the revolutionaries and we will partake of the moments of complicity with our dearly departed martyrs" (Valhalla being the paradise of the Vikings referenced by the Nazi ideologues).
- (35) See the site www.radioislam.com.
- (36) Ernst Zündel is tied to Ditleb Felderer in Sweden and to Robert Faurisson in France. Both supported him during his trial

for revisionism and incitement of racial hatred in January of 1995.

(37) Born in 1941, Ditlieb Felderer, alias William Clover, is one of the commentators of the *Journal of Historical Review*, based in California. In Sweden, he edits an anti-Semitic periodical, *Jewish Information*. [**This information is outdated since 20 years...**]

(38) Ibid.

(39) In the review *Vieille Taupe*, the revisionist editor Pierre Guillaume explains, under the explicit title “Contre la Guerre impérialiste américaine et le bellicisme sioniste” [“Against the American imperialist War and Zionist warmongering”], that the American war in Iraq is the “result of a Zionist conspiracy” and that one finds among the organizers of the ceremony of August 2002 commemorating the deportation to Auschwitz of thousands of Jews of France “these same fanatical Zionist personalities who have militated in favor of the first Gulf War (1991) [and who] today support the monstrous projects of George W. Bush of the occupation of Iraq which could set off a Third World War”. Cf. “Contribution à la définition de l’unité des programmes révolutionnaires”, Circle of latter-day Zimmerwaldians et Kienthaliens, *Vieille Taupe*, January 2003.

(40) On the occasion of the first Gulf War, Robert Faurisson wrote to the rector of the mosque of Paris at the time, Tedjini Haddam, to express to him his “support for the Arab people oppressed by American-Zionist imperialism” as well as for the ambassador of Iraq. He appended to his letter the first issue of the revisionist *Revue d'Histoire* (which contained an article by the Tunisian Mondher Sfar, author of *The Judeo-Nazi Manifesto of Ariel Sharon*, 2001), as well as a declaration to be signed by intellectuals and responsible Muslims. Faurisson assures that he is “sensible to the particularly tragic ordeal suffered by Iraq”, as well as to the lot of “all the peoples of the Arab-Muslim world [...] with the exception perhaps of the Jewish community, in Israel and outside Israel, who have agitated so much in order that this war should break out”, in a letter sent to the ambassador of Iraq, January 18 of 1991, from the revisionist site *Aaargh*: <http://aaargh-international.org/>

(41) Cf. *Le Monde*, February 18, 1998.

(42) Cf. *Libération*, February 16, 1998.

(43) Cited in Valérie Igounet, *Histoire du négationnisme*, p. 481.

(44) In France, a Francophone Shiite Islamic publication, financed by Teheran, *Le Message de l'islam*, took the defensive: “Garaudy has never questioned the existence of the gas chambers; the Zionists take by that a vicious action against Garaudy, for the only thing the author contests is the number of Jews exterminated”, June 1996, p. 21.

(45) Limonov was condemned in February of 2003 in Moscow to 14 years of confinement for “preparation for terrorism, calling for a coup d'état, and the attempt to form armed groups”, *Le Monde*, February 3, 2003.

(46) See the European site of the “national-Bolshevik” movement: http://www.pcn-ncp.com/Le_National-Bolchevisme.htm.

(47) Alexandre Douguine, *Géographie de la victoire : fondements pour une géopolitique propre à la Russie*, Evrazia, Moscow, 1997. The majority of Eurasians oppose the Occidentalistic politics of Vladimir Putin.

(48) *Les Cahiers de l'Orient*, N° 41, 1er trimestre 1996, p. 33.

(49) Douguine invokes neo-Bolshevism, paganism and the “revolutionary, Spartan and anti-cosmopolitan” spirit; cf. Marlène Laruelle, “Alexandre Douguine : esquisse d'un eurasisme d'extrême droite en Russie post-soviétique” [Alexander Douguine: outline of an extreme right Eurasianism in post-Soviet Russia], *Revue d'Études comparatives Est-Ouest*, vol. 32, N° 3, 2001.

(50) *Zavtra*, February 16, 1999.

(51) Carlos, in Jean Michel Vernochet, op. cit., pp. 89-100; 210.

(52) The ex-Prime Minister Mahathir, artisan of the re-Islamicization of his country and promoter of the “third Islamo-Asiatic way”, held this talk at the summit of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, at Kuala Lumpur, on October 19, 2003.

Articles by Alexandre del Valle are available at: www.alexandrevalle.com.

<http://www.alexandrevalle.com/publications.php?id_art=131>

MOSCOW 2002

Revisionists visit Moscow

We just find this interview, translated from Russian, obtained in Moscow in May 2002 :

At the beginning of May two Western historians, **Jurgen Graf** from Switzerland and **Carlo Mattogno** from Italy, were in Moscow. They represent the so-called revisionist school of scholarship, which on the basis of archival documents and other sources casts doubt on the Zionist claims that the Holocaust, as a result of which 6 million Jews allegedly perished, is the central event of World War II.

The history of the revisionist school in the West is the history of unending persecution and direct physical terror against its representatives. Jurgen Graf himself will be forced behind bars in October, 2000. Graf and his colleague spoke on this and other topics during the course of their visit with *Russky Vestnik* editorial board member **Anatoly Mihailovich Ivanov**.

Q: *What were you sentenced for, and what lies ahead for you?*

GRAF: I'll tell you a little secret: Swiss jails are practically like hotels. There'll be a television. Writing and the use of a computer are allowed. It's like a prison for 'petty misdemeanors'. During my confinement I plan to study Serbo-Croatian. The situation in Yugoslavia interests me greatly. I used to be against the Serbs, but now I support them.

Q: *Why were you against the Serbs?*

GRAF: That's our traditional position. Public opinion in Western Europe was always on the side of the Croats. One might say that this is a prejudice, because I never seriously studied Balkan history. It's obvious that the Serbs are victims of American imperialism and that Serbia is the only country in Europe which dared to resist those bandits.

Q: *But to return to the first question: For what were you sentenced to prison?*

GRAF: It's called 'inciting racial hatred'. If you take issue with the existence of the gas chambers, then according to our Western laws that's 'inciting racial hatred and discrimination'.

Q: *In what countries do such laws exist?*

GRAF: Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France, Spain, Belgium, and Poland. But in Poland the law isn't in force yet. It exists on paper, but it's led to no convictions yet. One person, Professor Rataicak from the University of Opol, was prosecuted, but later vindicated. He lost his job, but he won't have to go behind bars. Because he didn't manage to sell very many books.

Q: *What are we to think of such laws, which prevent historians from researching certain issues?*

GRAF: I'd call these laws totalitarian: They violate our Constitution, because the Constitution guarantees freedom to express one's opinion, freedom of speech. This is a problem. The Constitution 'guarantees' everything, promises everything: freedom of research, freedom of speech, but these freedoms exist only on paper as soon as you begin to criticize the 'New World Order'. And in Germany the situation is significantly worse than in Switzerland. In our country [Switzerland] this law was passed only 4 years ago, and there have been only around 50 trials.

Q: *50 trials in all of Europe?*

GRAF: That's only in Switzerland. Of that number, eight were related to the Holocaust. But in Germany there have been hundreds of such [Holocaust-related] processes already.

Q: *Why, in your opinion, were such laws passed?*

GRAF: The reason is that the official historians are unable to answer our arguments. And we've been demanding a dialogue for a long time. What we want is a scholarly dialogue, without name-calling, without propaganda. If there are mistakes in our books, then they're obligated to point out those mistakes. But insasmuch as official history can't refute us, they simply forbid our books and pass such laws.

Q: *Given that such repressive measures are being used against you, would it be safe to say that the legal system, academia and other areas of public life in Switzerland and other countries are under Zionist control?*

GRAF: Absolutely! But of course the majority of the population knows nothing about it. They tell you you're free because you can vote; you can choose between socialists, liberals and so forth and newspapers published by various parties are freely available. But all these official parties: socialists, liberals, conservatives and so forth differ very little from one another. Their politics are basically one and the same. For example, Austria's Haider has been heavily criticized. They call him a fascist. But did you know that Haider justifies the aggression against Yugoslavia and the embargo against Iraq? He even supported the anti-revisionist law in 1993. There's a 'real patriot' for you! One could say that Haider is the conservative wing of the ruling party in Austria. He's like our Blocher, Switzerland's leading conservative. Almost all patriots support him because they think he's a real patriotic leader. But he also came out in favor of the [anti-revisionist] law.

Q: *Has Mattogno been subject to repression in Italy for his revisionist research into the Holocaust?*

GRAF: They've left him alone. Because there are no such laws there yet. Freedom, like in Russia.

IVANOV: In *Russky Vestnik* we published a story about the De Meo trial, based on materials from the Italian press. He's a retired teacher who was accused of revisionism but

vindicated.

Russky Vestnik also wrote about the trial of Mr. Amaudruz, a very frail and elderly historian who was sentenced to prison and a large fine. His books were also destroyed, just like in Nazi Germany.

GRAF: That process lasted 3 days. In my opinion that was the most horrible political trial of all those which have occurred in our country. It was worse than my trial. And our little organization "Vérité et Justice" plans to document the Amaudruz case, as well as all other such cases.

We've already prepared documentation about the so-called 'Bergier Report'. This report, which was commissioned by the Swiss government, asserts that Switzerland was responsible for the Holocaust. Partially. Because our government didn't protest against the persecution of Jews during the war. Bergier is the leading historian of that school. He teaches history somewhere in Western Switzerland, if I'm not mistaken. He's one of the leading Masons in Switzerland, a member of the 'Alpina' lodge, a fact which he doesn't hide.

Our organization published a severe assessment of that report, because it's a pure falsification of history.

Q: *What condition is the revisionist school in in Europe?*

GRAF: There are very few 'pure' scholars. Propagandists are everywhere, but there are very few historians who approach the problem on the basis of scientific evidence.

This is our third trip to Moscow. Your archives contain a huge quantity of important documents. The books which we've written on Majdanek and Stutthof rely to a large degree on that material. And the big book which Carlo Mattogno is writing on the crematoria is illustrated with documents from your Russian archives.

Q: *What sort of documents was Mr. Mattogno able to find in our archives?*

MATTOGNO: Until the Moscow archives were opened to historians our work proceeded with great difficulty, because we relied on the statements of witnesses and documents on some of the concentration camps were hard to come by. Now the situation has improved significantly. In fact one could say that that purely scientific research on the German concentration camps began only after the opening of the Russian archives. This goes not only for us but for our opponents as well, who also use these documents. One example: Before our first trip to Moscow my private archive contained 500 original German documents relating to Auschwitz. Now I have more than 10,000 copies of original German documents in my possession. Here there are great possibilities for scientific work.

Q: *Isn't there a danger that if you talk about the existence of such documents in the archives in Moscow, they'll stop letting people in, and someone might destroy the documents?*

MATTOGNO: That's doubtful, but the archives might sell documents to Jewish organizations. For example, a large part of the documents relating to Masonry in the Special Archive were bought by French Masons and taken out of the country.

Q: *And they were sold illegally, in violation of Russian law...*

Now, during the 55th anniversary of the victory over Germany, they've been making a big deal of the 6 million Jewish victims. In Auschwitz there was once a memorial plaque claiming that 4 million died there, for the most part Jews. But now our TV commentators are telling us that 2.5 million died at Auschwitz. What happened to the other 1.5 million?

GRAF: I'd like to mention that the official figure in Poland is now 1,200,000. Mattogno, who is relying strictly on German documents, is in agreement with that figure.

Q: *Is that figure just for Jews, or is that for all victims in Auschwitz?*

MATTOGNO: That's for all victims, and it's my belief that roughly half of them were Jews.

Q: *What was the fate of those prisoners who passed through Auschwitz, but were not registered there?*

MATTOGNO: Many prisoners were sent on to camps in the Baltic States, and the Germans registered them there. We don't know the exact figure, but it's around 600,000. I'd like to add that according to the official story all of these prisoners were killed in gas chambers immediately upon arrival at Auschwitz. But we know better, of course.

As far as the '4 million' figure is concerned: that number contradicts even the

statements of witnesses. That was the conclusion of the Soviet commission after the liberation of the camp, which relies on supposed capacity of the crematoria. Not on the real capacity, of course, because the Soviet commission exaggerated their capacity by 10 to 12 times. Then the commission multiplied their figure by the number of days the camp was in existence, and on that basis it was decided that 4 million had died there. Two weeks later the commission began interrogating former camp prisoners, and strangely enough all of them repeated the figure of 4 million. Thus that number became accepted as official. I must add that not one serious historian in the West now takes the 4 million figure seriously. For example, Hilberg asserts in his work that 1 million Jews and 300,000 non-Jews died at Auschwitz.

IVANOV: I translated materials about the Ernst Zundel trial in Canada. That was a ground-breaking trial.

GRAF: That trial was a huge catastrophe for Hilberg. He was exposed there.

IVANOV: Yes, and Professor Faurisson wrote: "I have witnessed the death of the Holocaust myth."

GRAF: A word about Hilberg, who is undoubtedly the main specialist among our opponents. One year ago I published a book about him and the Holocaust entitled *A Colossus on Clay Feet*, where I demonstrate what kind of deceptive methods Hilberg uses. Regarding, for example, the the number of victims in so-called 'death camps' he uses figures without citing any source, figures which are backed up by nothing. He simply makes his claims, and that's it. In most of the remainder of his work, on the other hand, where he deals with persecutions of Jews and deportations, he uses documentary evidence. But when he speaks of the gas chambers he relies exclusively on statements of witnesses. Of course this is not a valid historical method, because every serious historian knows that documents are more important than witnesses.

Q: *This is the 55th anniversary of the victory over Germany. Do you agree that heaviest burden in the struggle against fascism was carried by Russia, in the form of the Soviet Union, and by Russian soldiers? Russia's combined losses in the war were around 26 million. It's well known that in the West very little is said about these losses, and few know about them. But everyone knows about the '6 million' Jews, who are mentioned constantly. Do you think that Russians have the right to be indignant and feel offended by that?*

GRAF: That's a very good question. When we were working in the archives, Carlo said to me: "Here's a list of prisoners who died in the camps. There are only Russians, Poles and Germans here. No one's interested in that. No one says anything about the dead Russians, Poles and Germans. Our politicians are only interested in the Jews. Everyone talks about the dead Jews, but the dead of other nationalities seem to interest no one. This is unjust, a pure falsification of history. Because other nations suffered no less than the Jews, even more." In my opinion the Russian and German people suffered more than the Jews.

A few words about that horrible war: In my opinion, Hitler's biggest mistake was to attack the Soviet Union. That was a huge tragedy for all nations, not just Russians and Germans. Because our real enemy is not located in Moscow and never has been. Though I'm an anticommunist, I consider the main evildoer of that epoch to be not Stalin, not communism, but the Americans. Roosevelt. Hitler was simply obligated to come to a mutual understanding with Russia. As it turned out, the winners in that war were, above all, America and Zionism.

IVANOV: It's my belief that Hitler actually did come to a mutual understanding with Stalin and the leadership of the USSR. A pact was concluded. But the Western democracies in France, England and the US directed Hitler's aggression against the Soviet Union on purpose, in order to decimate and exhaust both sides... When Mr. Zundel came here he said that the main problem [here] is not with the Holocaust, which most in Russia correctly understand. But many on the German right, and I include Mr. Zundel in their number, support the theory advanced by so-called Viktor Suvorov (Vladimir Rezun) in his book "Icebreaker", that Hitler was not to blame for attacking Russia because Russia intended to attack Hitler, who launched a 'preventive war' in self-defense.

The conditional mood is of little value in history: "What would have happened if..." and so on and so forth. The fact remains that Hitler's Germany attacked Russia and the peoples of Russia (of Russian nationality for the most part) suffered 26 millions in losses. That's the main thing. You can say what you want, but Hitler gave in to poor advice and attacked Russia. That's history.

GRAF: In 1944 it seems that Hitler realized his mistake, but by then it was too late.

Q: *Are there film materials in the archives where you're doing your research?*

MATTOGNO: You've touched on an important issue, because we've been searching for a long time for Soviet aerial photographs. To date we know only of 50 American aerial photos, and we hope that there are ones like them in the Russian archives as well. It's highly unlikely that the Soviet army would have planned a major advance without reconnaissance photographs. In 1944 that task would have been much easier for Soviet aviation than for the Americans, because the nearest American bases were in Southern Italy.

And one more aspect: We know that the Soviet authorities hid many documents after the war because they contradicted the official version of events. One important example is the *Auschwitz Death Books*. These books were discovered in Russia only in 1999; nothing was known about them before then. That means they were purposely hidden by the authorities. And we surmise that there are many more documents like that. For example, we have no documents about Treblinka, Belzec, Sobibor: the so-called 'eastern death camps'. But it's impossible that the Germans produced no documentation about them. We think that the Soviet authorities searched out these documents and hid them.

In Russia there must be super-secret archives which are unknown to us. For political reasons they're off-limits for the time being. One day they may serve as a powerful political weapon, which a future nationally-oriented government in Russia, of which we dream, will use.

Q: *And for that reason they're preventing the emergence of a nationally-oriented regime in Moscow?*

GRAF: That's one of the main reasons. But we hope that Putin will be a real Russian patriot.

Russky Vestnik is an Orthodox Christian weekly published in Moscow.
<<http://oag.ru/>>

INTERVIEW RAMI

"Where do you get your optimism from?"

"Radio Islam" founder Ahmed Rami interviews Yevgeny Shchekatikhin, editor of the St. Petersburg-based patriotic weekly Nashe Otechestvo (Our Fatherland). Translated from the Russian

Yevgeny Shchekatikhin is the founder-editor of the Petersburg-based political weekly "*Nashe Otechestvo*" (Our Fatherland). This publication has acquired legendary status all over Russia for its fearless mockery of the regime currently in power in Russia, corrupt to the core and totally subservient to US and Jewish interests. Shchekatikhin is noted for his uncompromising anti-Zionist position and idiosyncratic excursions into world history. Like another contemporary (and equally idiosyncratic) investigator of the Jewish question, Grigory Klimov, he adheres to the position that Adolf Hitler was a Zionist marionette -- an idea not so far-fetched as it seems if we consider the direct consequences of the rise and fall of the Third Reich: namely, 45 million dead Poles, Russians, Germans and other Aryans -- the bravest and brightest of their nations, the creation of the 'Holocaust' legend (the necessary precondition for the creation of the state of Israel), and the de-facto annexation of Western Europe (and Germany in particular) by Judeo-American interests. There's also much evidence that not only Hitler but most of his inner circle were hiding something important from the German people, namely their Jewish ancestry. That Hitler's paternal grandfather was a Jew, for example, is now universally known. For more on this topic, read Henneke Kardel's "Hitler, Founder of Israel." (Incidentally, is 'nationalist' politician Zhirinovskiy (whose real surname is Edelstein) being groomed as a 'Russian Hitler' by the Zionists, in order to repeat their 'failed' National Socialist experiment in our country? This is an interesting, and frightening, possibility to ponder. Consider the fact that Zhirinovskiy is held up by the Jewish-controlled Western press as a bogeyman, while being portrayed as a harmless and lovable clown by the very same Jewish-controlled media in Russia herself.)

The following interview is notable in that it was taken by the well-known Moroccan-

Swedish activist Ahmed Rami, founder of "Radio Islam", who came to St. Petersburg especially for the purpose. (Rami returned to Russia for a revisionist conference held last month.) The article begins with an introduction by Shekeatikhin himself. I apologize in advance for any factual errors which it may contain. The editor-patriot is not always careful in checking his facts. For example, he states that Rami continues his radio broadcasts in Stockholm, though I believe the Swedish government shut down his station some years ago. He also incorrectly identifies Rami's nationality, a mistake which I silently corrected.

On the 7th of December, 2001 the legendary Moroccan patriot Ahmed Rami, who for many years has been broadcasting on "Radio Islam" in Stockholm in Arabic, English, Swedish and Spanish, paid a visit to our offices. We've maintained business contacts for a long time: Two years ago a worker from "Radio Islam" made an interview of me, in which **I urged Muslims to unite with Orthodox Christians in a joint struggle against World Zionism.**

Ahmed Rami put that interview on the Internet in all of the above-named languages (for he knows them all). Of course the Jews couldn't leave a well-known fighter against Jewry in peace and organized a legal persecution of the patriot in Stockholm for "inflaming religious and national hatred" on the pages of the Internet. The pro-Jewish judge in the Swedish capital sentenced Ahmed to a fine of \$600 thousand. Naturally, that was more money than the middle-school teacher of Spanish had at his disposal and the "soft-hearted" judges replaced the fine with six months' incarceration (one month for each \$100 thousand). After serving his sentence the patriot found himself out of a job and was forced to make ends meet giving private lessons. However that didn't break his will and he continues to unmask Zionists on the air and on the Internet. Now, after a three-year correspondence acquaintanceship we finally met face-to-face. Rami has come to St. Petersburg. In front of me sits a handsome, well-built, swarthy man of medium height, somewhat reminiscent of a Spanish toreador. He looks at his interlocutor with intelligent eyes, listening attentively to the answers to his questions. (Rami speaks English, and we communicate through an interpreter, a member of the St. Petersburg chapter of RNE fluent in English.) [*RNE: Russian National Unity, Russia's most well-known nationalist organization.* -- Editor]

I think it would be useful to pass on to the readers of "NO" a few excerpts from our two-hour chat.

A.R.: *What got you into the struggle against Zionism?*

Y.S.: The destructive work of the Zionists, who've seized power in our country.

A.R.: *But it must be dangerous and require a lot of courage. Where do you get it from?*

Y.S.: Well, for one thing, someone has to do battle against this infection. Why not me? Secondly, I don't want my children and grandchildren (and I have four children and four grandchildren) to be Jewish slaves. Thirdly, as a military man I swore an oath of loyalty to my people and my Fatherland. Not to Stalin, or Khrushchev, or Brezhnev, and of course not to the Zionist marionettes Gorbachev, Yeltsin and Putin, but to my folk and homeland. And I remain true to that oath. Fourthly, every citizen is obligated to defend his country from enemies. Today that defense is necessary as never before.

A.R.: *I know from my own experience that the Zionists will stop at nothing to stop the activities of people like you. Aren't you afraid of radical measures on their part?*

Y.S.: Without question, that's a possibility and wouldn't be a problem for them. But after I won a lawsuit in 1993 against the Regional Directorate of the Press for its attempt to close down my newspaper, and the case turned into an anti-Zionist political event, the Zionists have avoided open court cases involving me. Twice, in 1998 and 1999, accusations of "inflaming racial and religious hatred" against Jews were fabricated against me, but I was amnestied. What's more, in 1998 I insisted that the Prosecutor bring the case to court, but the judge told me that under no circumstances would a trial take place. So I signed an agreement for amnesty, with the formula: "I agree to amnesty, but I don't consider myself guilty."

In 1999 the Prosecutor once again accused me and once again offered me to sign an amnesty agreement. And again I demanded a trial. "You want to become a martyr?", asked the investigator. "Well, you've been making a martyr out of me for the past 10 years, without any effort on my part, persecuting me for the exercise of free speech, even resorting to the

criminal code as if I were a dangerous criminal outlaw. What I want is to dress up in my Soviet officer's parade uniform and put on white gloves and let them put me in the defendant's cage in the courtroom, with handcuffs on those white gloves, and I'll hire a lawyer, I'll defend myself even, and demonstrate those handcuffs to the people in the courtroom as a symbol of free speech in today's Russia." "I repeat:" said the investigator insistently, "There will be no trial!!!" It was then that I understood that it had gotten through to the Jews that any court case would be good advertisement for the newspaper. That's why they're always ready to frighten me with imprisonment, but they're afraid of any public legal action, understanding perfectly well that it won't be easy to prove their accusations of "inflaming national hatred".

Of course they could kill me. But here they're faced with the "Talkov phenomenon", when a murder gave birth to the image of a "patriot martyr" and increased hatred toward the Jews tenfold. [*Popular singer/songwriter Igor Talkov, whose repertoire ranged from patriotic to romantic songs, was killed backstage during a performance in St. Petersburg in 1991. His murderer, a certain Schliafman, avoided prosecution by boarding a plane to Israel, where he lives to this day.* -- Editor]

And finally, for those who've embarked on the path of struggle with the Jewish occupation of our country death isn't frightening: The Lord will take us as martyrs for a just cause, while our murderers will be consigned to the eternal flames of Hell.

A.R.: *But the Zionists' power in Russia is virtually limitless. Where do you get your optimism and faith in victory?*

Y.S.: From world history. Remember the Persian Empire. The Jews were celebrating in triumph, praising Mordechai and Esther... After destroying the Roman Empire they thought they were close to world dominion... The revolution in Russia in 1917 once again gave them hope of the irreversibility of Jewish power... Alas, nothing came of it. They killed off each other in internecine struggles called "purgues". After the Second World War they began to undermine the country from within, returning to power under Khrushchev. After 20 years of undermining they hit us with Gorbachev's betrayal... But the thing is that the Jews can never divide up money and power among themselves! And today they continue to gnaw at each other to possess the beachheads from which to continue the rape and despoilment of our great country. It's these internecine conflicts which will help us to cast off the Jewish yoke in Russia. And just take a look at Russian history: Is this the first "time of troubles" we've experienced? Have enemies never occupied the Kremlin before? Where are those enemies now? And these will meet the same fate!

The international position of Zion is getting worse from day to day. The whole world is mobilizing in the war with Jewish globalization and the "New World Order". According to the Zionist plan, China and Japan are next in line for enslavement after Russia. And if communist/Masonic China is unconcerned at present by the Jewish question, the Japanese are busy publishing anti-Zionist literature such as "Mein Kampf", the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" and so forth, insisting that all government officials read this literature and prevent the Jews from gaining control over politics, finance, the mass-media and other government infrastructure.

So the expulsion of the Jews from Russia is inevitable -- It's historically predestined. And they'll have to celebrate their "Purims" and "Great October Revolutions" somewhere in Australia or New Zealand (those 'emergency airfields' of Zion) in remembrance of past Jewish triumphs, and once again start hatching their destructive plans to rule the world. But the peoples of the Earth are getting progressively wiser to the vile intrigues of the Zionists and there'll be a worldwide explosion of indignation so mighty that a real, not imagined, holocaust will erupt on the heads of the Jews, beating the taste for world domination out of them for a long time to come.

Ahmed Rami thanked me for our chat, took out a subscription for the newspaper "Nashe Otechestvo", and promised to arrange for placement of translations of our most important articles into the above-mentioned languages on the Internet. Then the Islamic patriot set out to meet with German nationalists. Such international meetings are the pledge of future defeat for the Zionists! The enemy will be beaten! Victory will be ours!

Nashe Otechestvo is a Russian patriotic weekly published in St. Petersburg, Russia. Added to Site: 23 Feb. 2002 - Last modified: 28 Aug. 2002

The Russian-language original of this article is located at:
<http://private.peterlink.ru/vgri/167/otkuda.html>

<<http://oag.ru/>>

CRAZY ECONOMY

Why Gas Costs \$3.00 per Gallon

Charles E. Carlson

I was gassing my car beside a younger man filling a SUV with a big gas tank. "Hey SUV, this doesn't seem like much a bargain to me." He replied that he had moved to the Valley five years ago and gas was \$.99 at the same pump then. I asked, "Do you know for sure why the price so high?" He didn't know for sure, but he had some ideas, "it's not because it is mostly taxes, as in Europe, and at least they get something for it.... in programs." He went on, "I'm not sure we get much for our high prices."

"Has it occurred to you that this is simply the cost of paying for the war?" I asked. SUV wanted to know how I could know this, and here is what I told him:

"Five years ago an eye witness confirmed to me that Iraq had so much gas for sale that Saddam Hussein's government was selling it to anyone inside Iraq for four to five cents a gallon. Now that we have bombed Iraq into the Stone Age, our prices are on the way to \$3.00. And our leaders want to bomb Iran, the next biggest oil producer they can find. How much do you think that will cost us?" Just then, SUV's tank filled up. "I gotta go," he said, as he pocketed his receipt of \$48.00. Had he stayed a little longer, I would have given him a homey analogy:

"Suppose your government kills half the black and white cows in Wisconsin. Do you need a degree in animal husbandry to know what will happen to the price of milk in the supermarket?"

I am sorry to say, it's that simple; and there can be no excuse for the old, tired: "We did not know there would be a cost!" lies we hear from those who wanted the war. Have'nt we already heard that line? We Hold These Truths didn't just dream up this strange but simple price theory this morning. Here are a few quotes from our story: "Why Gas costs \$2.00 a Gallon," published March 27, 2000, just five years ago, and three years before our leaders decided to destroy the rest of the "black and white cows."

Quote: That same week, in a Middle Eastern country, a busload of Americans were stretching their legs during a fuel stop. A.W. Blumhorst, calculated the conversion of gallons to liters and native currency to US dollars in his notebook. He watched the attendant pump diesel fuel into the European made bus. "Do I have this figured right?" he asked the English-speaking bus driver. Is it possible you are buying fuel for four cents a gallon US? Are you really going to fill this bus for a 10-dollar bill? Maybe I should take a gallon home to Missouri or they will never believe me!"

Quote: Mr. Blumhorst learned on his trip to the Middle East that there is enough oil in the world to keep energy prices low if we were only allowed to buy it. It sells for pennies a gallon in those producing countries that are not in the good graces of our self serving Government leaders and their Warmaker bosses. Quote: Gasoline is selling for a nickel a gallon in Iraq, and a single dollar will buy 25 gallons of diesel fuel because Iraq is not allowed to sell its oil. In Iraq, children are starving while American bombs still fall regularly on the survivors. Yet American truckers and farmers cannot produce and haul food for lack of fuel.

<<http://www.whtt.org/>>

US GIFT

After the War Comes Cancer

Iraqi women fear for their children's future

Jürgen Hanefeld

Information collected for a German project investigating the use of uranium-charged ammunition in Iraq shows that when Iraqi women fear for their children's health, it is with good reason.

After two wars where oil wells were torched, chemical factories bombed and radioactive ammunition fired, the first thing Iraqi women ask when giving birth is not if it is a boy or a girl, but if it is normal or deformed. The number of cancer cases and children born with deformities has skyrocketed after the two Gulf Wars.

"Since 1991 the number of children born with birth deformities has quadrupled," said Dr. Janan Hassan, who runs a children's clinic at a hospital in Basra in southern Iraq. "The same is the case for the number of children under 15 who are diagnosed with cancer. Mostly, it is leukemia. Almost 80 percent of the children die because we neither have medicine nor the possibility to give them chemotherapy."

Doctors have also recorded an extreme rise in cancer cases among adults. "In 2004 we diagnosed 25 percent more cancer cases than the year before and the mortality rate increased eight-fold between 1988 and 1991," said Dr. Jawad al-Ali of the Sadr Hospital in Basra.

Doctors against nuclear war

Hassan and al-Ali are two of 15 Iraqi specialists who have joined forces with German scientists in a project to research diseases provoked by acts of war, financed by the German Academic Exchange Service.

In Iraq, burning oil wells, bombed chemical factories, demolished production sites for chemical weapons and even the use of radioactive ammunition are just a few of the things which may have triggered diseases there.

"As epidemiologists, we are quite sure that other diseases than cancer and birth deformities also have to be considered," said project leader Wolfgang Hoffmann from the University of Greifswald.

The scientists involved in the project met through the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW). All have a special interest in the consequences of using depleted-uranium (DU) ammunition, the German project's main focus.

British and American uranium bombs

In the two US-led wars on Iraq, missile warheads containing the depleted uranium-238 were used. While it is only lightly radioactive, it is an extremely tough waste-product to contain because the uranium pulverizes and contaminates the whole surrounding area with radioactivity at the moment of the explosion.

"Naturally, the nations leading the war refuse to acknowledge that this type of uranium can be harmful. But as an epidemiologist, I have to say that every bit of radiation can give rise to cancer. It's just a question if what was fired in this case led to an increase in the number of cancer cases," said Professor Eberhard Greiser from the University of Bremen.

As with many of the questions arising from the project so far, there is no definite answer. But al-Ali tried to give a partial answer.

"In Basra in 1991, the Americans and the British dropped at least 300 tons of this kind of ammunition in one battle. That was the battle where they destroyed all the tanks of the then Republican Army. After the war, the population was urged to gather all weapons and sell them to the government. Also if people had guns or bazookas or whatever they found in the desert, they were told to bring it with them," he said.

According to al-Ali's calculations, approximately 750,000 people in Basra and the surrounding areas were exposed to radiation as a result.

Finding the evidence

The doctors say the connection between the contamination of hundred of thousands of people on one side and the rising number of cancer cases on the other is beyond doubt, but proving it is not easy.

"To prove it, we would have to demonstrate that there was uranium 238 on the patients' clothes or in their body fluid. And besides, cancer is a multi-causal disease. How would we be able to give 100 percent proof?" al-Ali asked.

Despite the resigned attitudes among many of her colleagues, Hassan firmly believes that the radioactive missiles used by the Americans and the British are responsible for the increased incidence of cancer in Iraq since the early 1990s. She hopes a future independent Iraqi government will seek compensation from Washington and London. "We have to demand it. That is the price of the war," she said.

09.03.2005

<<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,1564,1510710,00.html>>

DEADLY QUESTIONS

For the Record

Dr. Fredrick Toben

Personal and public matters arising out of Ernst Zündel
imprisoned in Germany.

Is Revisionism in crisis as stimulated by Ernst Zündel's
deportation from Canada to Germany?

1. Should he or should he not contest the impossible in a court of law where his guilt is already established?

1.1 If he argues the case, then he will further incriminate himself because in a German court of law privilege does not attach itself to anything said in court. Hence, any defence mounted by an accused will merely compound the crime.

1.2 If he does contest the matter, then his trial could become a massive propaganda trial that the German and Jewish "Holocaust" believers would not like to see happen in Germany.

2. German justice is capricious.

2.1 In matters of F Töben, 8, 10 November 1999, and appeal 12 December 2000

2.2 In the first week of July 2003 I traveled from Paris to Germany, and on 8 July, while having a wee-wee break at an isolated forest spot, a police patrol spotted me and checked my details, then took me to the Pforzheim Police Station where I was advised that there is a European Arrest Warrant out for me. I advised the officers that had I known, then I would not have entered Germany. Paris Airport did not stop me and I had submitted my passport to them for inspection. After a two hour wait at the police station I was permitted to leave, which I did without breaking the speed limit on a country road that took me France.

2.3 Common law has the concept Legal Ambush - something German law actually practices.

2.4 On my return home, on I wrote a letter to the Bundeskriminal Amt (BKA) Wiesbaden, seeking clarification about my ban from Germany. A reply from the BKA, dated 22 October 2003, from a Mr Alfons Wisser, stated that there was nothing against me and I was free to travel to Germany.

2.4 On 12 April 2004, at Helsinki airport while waiting for my plane to depart for Moscow, I was advised by Finnish border police that I should not have been permitted to enter the European Union, on account of Germany having imposed a travel ban on me that prevents me from entering the EU. It was dated 9 January 2004.

2.5 Upon returning home I again wrote to the BKA Wiesbaden and requested an update of my status. A letter, dated 22 June 2004, from Mr Alfons Wisser confirmed that I had been banned from entering the EU, on account of my having been arrested, which generated the trial at Mannheim on 8 and 10 November 1999.

2.6 Judge Adam of the Landgericht Mannheim advised me via the Australian Attorney General's office, Canberra that on 27 May 2004, he had issued a Summons, setting down a trial date for 8, 9 and 11 November 2004. This was to be the re-trial as ordered by the Karlsruhe Appeals Court on 12 December 2000. Although I had indicated to Judge Adam that I was quite prepared to come to Germany but only if Horst Mahler could be my defence counsel (Mahler was stripped of practicing law soon after by a Berlin judge) I advise the presiding Judge that I am banned from entering Germany. On 8 November 2004 the judge then abandoned the trial to give himself an opportunity to check up on my claim that I was barred from entering Germany, the European Union something that I had advertised on Adelaide Institute's website.

2.7 In the second week of January 2005 I received an undated letter from trial judge Adam that in a judgment of 21 December 2004, of which I knew nothing, I had forfeited my bail money of \$6,000 because according to his enquiries there was no ban imposed on my coming to Germany.

2.8 This astounded me - and so on 4 February 2005 I wrote to the BKA Wiesbaden to have this matter clarified. On 14 March 2005 I received a reply, dated 2 March 2005 ñ again from Alfons Wisser ñ stating that there was nothing outstanding against me in either in the Schengen system nor in the German system, and that I was free to travel to Germany. [ÖSie weder im Schengener Informationssystem (SIS) noch im (nationalen) Polizeilichen Informationssystem (INPOL) zur Zur,ckweisung (Einreiseverbot) ausgeschrieben sind.]

3. The BKA, Wiesbaden as an agent if conflicting information.

3.1 I have again written to the BKA requesting information when the ban, operational on 9 January 2004, was lifted. My claim that I could not come to Germany for the re-trial has thereby been negated. I should know when the ban on my entry to Germany was lifted. It was operational on 9 January 2004, as confirmed by the BKA as late as 22 June 2004, after Judge Adam had issued the Summons of 27 May 2004 and set the trial date for November 8, 9, 11 November 2004. Surely the still meticulous German bureaucracy will have a date for me when, after 22 June 2004, the ban on my entry to Germany was lifted - or is a bureaucrat-politician fiddling the books so as to entrap me, set a legal ambush for me? If this is the case, then knowing the exactitude of the German bureaucracy's mindset, there will be a notation somewhere that will point out where it is fiddling with the books so as to legally entrap me.

3.2 What this chronology indicates is that there is some kind of co-ordination between the judge and the BKA that had the ban lifted so that the Judge could make a judgment about the DM6,000, which should have been returned to me. On 21 December 2004, Judges Adam, B,ltmann, Egerer decided to confiscate my bail, and I was given a week in which to lodge an appeal. I received the undated notification of the judgment per mail in the second week in January 2005, and so it was not possible to appeal against this judgment. However, on 25 January 2005 I did send my objection to the matter via the Australian Federal Police who sent the matter per the Australian Attorney General's office, to Mannheim Court.

3.3 I had been assigned a court appointed defence counsel, RA Wingerter, who to this day has not made contact with me. I rang Judge Adam about it, and he expressed surprise at his not contacting me. Judge Adam thought that the counsel's motion presented to court on 8 November 2004, originated from me, i.e. that I had a travel ban to the EU and that I was an unwelcome visitor to Germany. I advised Judge Adam that this court-appointed counsel has not spoken with me, and that he must have received the information presented to the judge from our website.

14 march 2005

<<http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>>

GOLDFINGER

How The Bush Family Made Its Fortune From The Nazis The Dutch Connection

By John Loftus

John Loftus, is a former U.S. Department of Justice Nazi War Crimes prosecutor, the President of the Florida Holocaust Museum and the highly respected author of numerous books on the CIA-Nazi connection, including *The Belarus Secret* and *The Secret War Against the Jews*, both of which have extensive material on the Bush-Rockefeller-Nazi connection.

For the Bush family, it is a lingering nightmare. For their Nazi clients, the Dutch connection was the mother of all money laundering schemes. From 1945 until 1949, one of the lengthiest and, it now appears, most futile interrogations of a Nazi war crimes suspect began in the American Zone of Occupied Germany. Multibillionaire steel magnate Fritz Thyssen-the man whose steel combine was the cold heart of the Nazi war machine-talked and talked and talked to a joint US-UK interrogation team. For four long years, successive teams of inquisitors tried to break Thyssen's simple claim to possess neither foreign bank accounts nor interests in foreign corporations, no assets that might lead to the missing billions in assets of the Third Reich. The inquisitors failed utterly.

Why? Because what the wily Thyssen deposed was, in a sense, true. What the Allied investigators never understood was that they were not asking Thyssen the right question. Thyssen did not need any foreign bank accounts because his family secretly owned an entire chain of banks. He did not have to transfer his Nazi assets at the end of World War II, all he had to do was transfer the ownership documents - stocks, bonds, deeds and trusts--from his bank in Berlin through his bank in Holland to his American friends in New York City: Prescott Bush and Herbert Walker. Thyssen's partners in crime were the father and father-in-law of a future President of the United States.

The allied investigators underestimated Thyssen's reach, his connections, his motives, and his means. The web of financial entities Thyssen helped create in the 1920's remained a mystery for the rest of the twentieth century, an almost perfectly hidden underground sewer pipeline for moving dirty money, money that bankrolled the post-war fortunes not only of the Thyssen industrial empire...but the Bush family as well. It was a secret Fritz Thyssen would take to his grave.

It was a secret that would lead former US intelligence agent William Gowen, now pushing 80, to the very doorstep of the Dutch royal family. The Gowens are no strangers to controversy or nobility. His father was one of President Roosevelt's diplomatic emissaries to Pope Pius XII, leading a futile attempt to persuade the Vatican to denounce Hitler's treatment of Jews. It was his son, William Gowen, who served in Rome after World War II as a Nazi hunter and investigator with the U.S. Army Counter Intelligence Corps. It was Agent Gowen who first discovered the secret Vatican Ratline for smuggling Nazis in 1949. It was also the same William Gowen who began to uncover the secret Dutch pipeline for smuggling Nazi money in 1999.

A half-century earlier, Fritz Thyssen was telling the allied investigators that he had no interest in foreign companies, that Hitler had turned on him and seized most of his property. His remaining assets were mostly in the Russian Occupied Zone of Germany (which he knew were a write-off anyway). His distant (and disliked) relatives in neutral nations like Holland were the actual owners of a substantial percentage of the remaining German industrial base. As innocent victims of the Third Reich, they were lobbying the allied occupation governments in Germany, demanding restitution of the property that had been seized from them by the Nazis.

Under the rules of the Allied occupation of Germany, all property owned by citizens of a neutral nation which had been seized by the Nazis had to be returned to the neutral citizens upon proper presentation of documents showing proof of ownership. Suddenly, all sorts of neutral parties, particularly in Holland, were claiming ownership of various pieces of the Thyssen empire. In his cell, Fritz Thyssen just smiled and waited to be released from prison while members of the Dutch royal family and the Dutch intelligence service reassembled his pre-war holdings for him.

The British and American interrogators may have gravely underestimated Thyssen but they nonetheless knew they were being lied to. Their suspicions focused on one Dutch Bank in particular, the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart, in Rotterdam. This bank did a lot of business with the Thyssens over the years. In 1923, as a favor to him, the Rotterdam bank loaned the money to build the very first Nazi party headquarters in Munich. But somehow the allied investigations kept going nowhere, the intelligence leads all seemed to dry up.

If the investigators realized that the US intelligence chief in postwar Germany, Allen Dulles, was also the Rotterdam bank's lawyer, they might have asked some very interesting questions. They did not know that Thyssen was Dulles' client as well. Nor did they ever realize that it was Allen Dulles's other client, Baron Kurt Von Schroeder who was the Nazi trustee for the Thyssen companies which now claimed to be owned by the Dutch. The Rotterdam Bank was at the heart of Dulles' cloaking scheme, and he guarded its secrets jealously.

Several decades after the war, investigative reporter Paul Manning, Edward R. Murrow's colleague, stumbled across the Thyssen interrogations in the US National Archives. Manning intended to write a book about Nazi money laundering. Manning's manuscript was a dagger at Allen Dulles' throat: his book specifically mentioned the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart by name, albeit in passing. Dulles volunteered to help the unsuspecting Manning with his manuscript, and sent him on a wild goose chase, searching for Martin Bormann in South America.

Without knowing that he had been deliberately sidetracked, Manning wrote a forward to his book personally thanking Allen Dulles for his "assurance that I was "on the right track, and should keep going."Dulles sent Manning and his manuscript off into the swamps of obscurity. The same "search for Martin Bormann"scam was also used to successfully discredit Ladislav Farago, another American journalist probing too far into the laundering

of Nazi money. American investigators had to be sent anywhere but Holland.

And so the Dutch connection remained unexplored until 1994 when I published the book "The Secret War Against the Jews." As a matter of historical curiosity, I mentioned that Fritz Thyssen (and indirectly, the Nazi Party) had obtained their early financing from Brown Brothers Harriman, and its affiliate, the Union Banking Corporation. Union Bank, in turn, was the Bush family's holding company for a number of other entities, including the "Holland American Trading Company."

It was a matter of public record that the Bush holdings were seized by the US government after the Nazis overran Holland. In 1951, the Bush's reclaimed Union Bank from the US Alien Property Custodian, along with their "neutral" Dutch assets. I did not realize it, but I had stumbled across a very large piece of the missing Dutch connection. Bush's ownership of the Holland-American investment company was the missing link to Manning's earlier research in the Thyssen investigative files. In 1981, Manning had written:

"Thyssen's first step in a long dance of tax and currency frauds began [in the late 1930's] when he disposed of his shares in the Dutch Hollandische-Amerikanische Investment Corporation to be credited to the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart, N.V., Rotterdam, the bank founded in 1916 by August Thyssen Senior."

In this one obscure paragraph, in a little known book, Manning had unwittingly documented two intriguing points: 1) The Bush's Union Bank had apparently bought the same corporate stock that the Thyssens were selling as part of their Nazi money laundering, and 2) the Rotterdam Bank, far from being a neutral Dutch institution, was founded by Fritz Thyssen's father. In hindsight, Manning and I had uncovered different ends of the Dutch connection.

After reading the excerpt in my book about the Bush's ownership of the Holland-American trading Company, retired US intelligence agent William Gowen began to put the pieces of the puzzle together. Mr. Gowen knew every corner of Europe from his days as a diplomat's son, an American intelligence agent, and a newspaperman. William Gowen deserves sole credit for uncovering the mystery of how the Nazi industrialists hid their money from the Allies at the end of World War II.

In 1999, Mr. Gowen traveled to Europe, at his own expense, to meet a former member of Dutch intelligence who had detailed inside information about the Rotterdam bank. The scrupulous Gowen took a written statement and then had his source read and correct it for error. Here, in summary form, is how the Nazis hid their money in America.

After World War I, August Thyssen had been badly burned by the loss of assets under the harsh terms of the Versailles treaty. He was determined that it would never happen again. One of his sons would join the Nazis; the other would be neutral. No matter who won the next war, the Thyssen family would survive with their industrial empire intact. Fritz Thyssen joined the Nazis in 1923; his younger brother married into Hungarian nobility and changed his name to Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza. The Baron later claimed Hungarian as well as Dutch citizenship. In public, he pretended to detest his Nazi brother, but in private they met at secret board meetings in Germany to coordinate their operations. If one brother were threatened with loss of property, he would transfer his holdings to the other.

To aid his sons in their shell game, August Thyssen had established three different banks during the 1920's -- The August Thyssen Bank in Berlin, the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart in Rotterdam, and the Union Banking Corporation in New York City. To protect their corporate holdings, all the brothers had to do was move the corporate paperwork from one bank to the other. This they did with some regularity. When Fritz Thyssen "sold" the Holland-American Trading Company for a tax loss, the Union Banking Corporation in New York bought the stock. Similarly, the Bush family invested the disguised Nazi profits in American steel and manufacturing corporations that became part of the secret Thyssen empire.

When the Nazis invaded Holland in May 1940, they investigated the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart in Rotterdam. Fritz Thyssen was suspected by Hitler's auditors of being a tax fraud and of illegally transferring his wealth outside the Third Reich. The Nazi auditors were right: Thyssen felt that Hitler's economic policies would dilute his wealth through ruinous war inflation. He had been smuggling his war profits out through Holland. But the Rotterdam vaults were empty of clues to where the money had gone. The Nazis did not know that all of the documents evidencing secret Thyssen ownership had been quietly shipped back to the August Thyssen Bank in Berlin, under the friendly supervision of Baron Kurt Von Schroeder. Thyssen spent the rest of the war under VIP house arrest. He had fooled Hitler, hidden his immense profits, and now it was time to fool the Americans with same shell game.

As soon as Berlin fell to the allies, it was time to ship the documents back to Rotterdam so that the "neutral" bank could claim ownership under the friendly supervision of Allen Dulles, who, as the OSS intelligence chief in 1945 Berlin, was well placed to handle any troublesome investigations. Unfortunately, the August Thyssen Bank had been bombed during the war, and the documents were buried in the underground vaults beneath the rubble. Worse, the vaults lay in the Soviet Zone of Berlin.

According to Gowen's source, Prince Bernhard commanded a unit of Dutch intelligence, which dug up the incriminating corporate papers in 1945 and brought them back to the "neutral" bank in Rotterdam. The pretext was that the Nazis had stolen the crown jewels of his wife, Princess Juliana, and the Russians gave the Dutch permission to dig up the vault and retrieve them. Operation Juliana was a Dutch fraud on the Allies who searched high and low for the missing pieces of the Thyssen fortune.

In 1945, the former Dutch manager of the Rotterdam bank resumed control only to discover that he was sitting on a huge pile of hidden Nazi assets. In 1947, the manager threatened to inform Dutch authorities, and was immediately fired by the Thyssens. The somewhat naive bank manager then fled to New York City where he intended to talk to Union Bank director Prescott Bush. As Gowen's Dutch source recalled, the manager intended "to reveal [to Prescott Bush] the truth about Baron Heinrich and the Rotterdam Bank, [in order that] some or all of the Thyssen interests in the Thyssen Group might be seized and confiscated as German enemy property. "The manager's body was found in New York two weeks later.

Similarly, in 1996 a Dutch journalist Eddy Roever went to London to interview the Baron, who was neighbors with Margaret Thatcher. Roever's body was discovered two days later. Perhaps, Gowen remarked dryly, it was only a coincidence that both healthy men had died of heart attacks immediately after trying to uncover the truth about the Thyssens.

Neither Gowen nor his Dutch source knew about the corroborating evidence in the Alien Property Custodian archives or in the OMGUS archives. Together, the two separate sets of US files overlap each other and directly corroborate Gowen's source. The first set of archives confirms absolutely that the Union Banking Corporation in New York was owned by the Rotterdam Bank. The second set (quoted by Manning) confirms that the Rotterdam Bank in turn was owned by the Thyssens.

It is not surprising that these two American agencies never shared their Thyssen files. As the noted historian Burton Hersh documented:

"The Alien Property Custodian, Leo Crowley, was on the payroll of the New York J. Henry Schroeder Bank where Foster and Allen Dulles both sat as board members. Foster arranged an appointment for himself as special legal counsel for the Alien Property Custodian while simultaneously representing [German] interests against the custodian."

No wonder Allen Dulles had sent Paul Manning on a wild goose chase to South America. He was very close to uncovering the fact that the Bush's bank in New York City was secretly owned by the Nazis, before during and after WWII. Once Thyssen ownership of the Union Banking Corporation is proven, it makes out a prima facie case of treason against the Dulles and Bush families for giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war.

The first key fact to be proven in any criminal case is that the Thyssen family secretly owned the Bush's Bank. Apart from Gowen's source, and the twin American files, a third set of corroboration comes from the Thyssen family themselves. In 1979, the present Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza (Fritz Thyssen's nephew) prepared a written family history to be shared with his top management. A copy of this thirty-page tome entitled "The History of the Thyssen Family and Their Activities" was provided by Gowen's source. It contains the following Thyssen admissions:

"Thus, at the beginning of World War II the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart had become the holding of my father's companies - a Dutch firm whose only shareholder was a Hungarian citizen..Prior to 1929, it held the shares of .the August Thyssen Bank, and also American subsidiaries and the Union Banking Corporation, New York.The shares of all the affiliates were [in 1945] with the August Thyssen Bank in the East Sector of Berlin, from where I was able to have them transferred into the West at the last moment"

"After the war the Dutch government ordered an investigation into the status of the holding company and, pending the result, appointed a Dutch former general manager of my father who turned against our family.. In that same year, 1947, I returned to Germany for the

first time after the war, disguised as a Dutch driver in military uniform, to establish contact with our German directors"

"The situation of the Group gradually began to be resolved but it was not until 1955 that the German companies were freed from Allied control and subsequently disentangled. Fortunately, the companies in the group suffered little from dismantling. At last we were in a position to concentrate on purely economic problems -- the reconstruction and extension of the companies and the expansion of the organization."

"The banking department of the Bank voor Handel en Scheepvaart, which also functioned as the Group's holding company, merged in 1970 with Nederlandse Credietbank N.V. which increased its capital. The Group received 25 percent. The Chase Manhattan Bank holds 31%. The name Thyssen-Bornemisza Group was selected for the new holding company."

Thus the twin US Archives, Gowen's Dutch source, and the Thyssen family history all independently confirm that President Bush's father and grandfather served on the board of a bank that was secretly owned by the leading Nazi industrialists. The Bush connection to these American institutions is a matter of public record. What no one knew, until Gowen's brilliant research opened the door, was that the Thyssens were the secret employers of the Bush family.

But what did the Bush family know about their Nazi connection and when did they know it? As senior managers of Brown Brothers Harriman, they had to have known that their American clients, such as the Rockefellers, were investing heavily in German corporations, including Thyssen's giant Vereinigte Stahlwerke. As noted historian Christopher Simpson repeatedly documents, it is a matter of public record that Brown Brother's investments in Nazi Germany took place under the Bush family stewardship.

When war broke out was Prescott Bush stricken with a case of Waldheimers disease, a sudden amnesia about his Nazi past? Or did he really believe that our friendly Dutch allies owned the Union Banking Corporation and its parent bank in Rotterdam? It should be recalled that in January 1937, he hired Allen Dulles to "cloak" his accounts. But cloak from whom? Did he expect that happy little Holland was going to declare war on America? The cloaking operation only makes sense in anticipation of a possible war with Nazi Germany. If Union Bank was not the conduit for laundering the Rockefeller's Nazi investments back to America, then how could the Rockefeller-controlled Chase Manhattan Bank end up owning 31% of the Thyssen group after the war?

It should be noted that the Thyssen group (TBG) is now the largest industrial conglomerate in Germany, and with a net worth of more than \$50 billion dollars, one of the wealthiest corporations in the world. TBG is so rich it even bought out the Krupp family, famous arms makers for Hitler, leaving the Thyssens as the undisputed champion survivors of the Third Reich. Where did the Thyssens get the start-up money to rebuild their empire with such speed after World War II?

The enormous sums of money deposited into the Union Bank prior to 1942 is the best evidence that Prescott Bush knowingly served as a money launderer for the Nazis. Remember that Union Banks' books and accounts were frozen by the U.S. Alien Property Custodian in 1942 and not released back to the Bush family until 1951. At that time, Union Bank shares representing hundreds of millions of dollars worth of industrial stocks and bonds were unblocked for distribution. Did the Bush family really believe that such enormous sums came from Dutch enterprises? One could sell tulip bulbs and wooden shoes for centuries and not achieve those sums. A fortune this size could only have come from the Thyssen profits made from rearming the Third Reich, and then hidden, first from the Nazi tax auditors, and then from the Allies.

The Bushes knew perfectly well that Brown Brothers was the American money channel into Nazi Germany, and that Union Bank was the secret pipeline to bring the Nazi money back to America from Holland. The Bushes had to have known how the secret money circuit worked because they were on the board of directors in both directions: Brown Brothers out, Union Bank in.

Moreover, the size of their compensation is commensurate with their risk as Nazi money launderers. In 1951, Prescott Bush and his father in law each received one share of Union Bank stock, worth \$750,000 each. One and a half million dollars was a lot of money in 1951. But then, from the Thyssen point of view, buying the Bushes was the best bargain of the war.

The bottom line is harsh: It is bad enough that the Bush family helped raise the money for Thyssen to give Hitler his start in the 1920's, but giving aid and comfort to the enemy in time of war is treason. The Bush's bank helped the Thyssens make the Nazi steel

that killed allied soldiers. As bad as financing the Nazi war machine may seem, aiding and abetting the Holocaust was worse. Thyssen's coal mines used Jewish slaves as if they were disposable chemicals. There are six million skeletons in the Thyssen family closet, and a myriad of criminal and historical questions to be answered about the Bush family's complicity.

First published September 27, 2000

Posted by Robert Lederman <robert.lederman@worldnet.att.net> February 9, 2002. This article is provided courtesy of Dr. Leonard G. Horowitz and Tetrahedron Publishing Group www.tetrahedron.org

<http://www.tetrahedron.org/articles/new_world_order/bush_nazis.html>

CHRISTIAN ZIONISTS

Why Some Christians Enable the Neo-Crusade and Others Oppose: Part 1

By Charles E. Carlson

Judaized-Christian churches focus on praising Jesus and accepting his “free” favors of eternal life, while deemphasizing the commitment to follow Christ. Mainline or traditional churches are showing a marked tendency to follow the financially successful example of evangelical competitors, while still trying to preach the difficult doctrine of following Christ toward the “strait gate.” Mainline churches are losing the battle in the marketplace, because they do not sufficiently understand why their competitors for men’s minds act as they do. If they understood the Judaized-Christian church in light of its history and teaching, they would not mirror it; they would renounce its heresy and trust in God to reward them for following Him.

Judaized-Christianity looks ever more like a political phenomenon with a religious face.* This well-defined term is preferable to the popular, idiomatic terms “Christian Right” and “Christian-Zionist,” formerly called “pre-millennialism,” “evangelical,” or “dispensationalist.” Whatever you choose to call these people (this author is a qualified long term alumnus) they have integrated secular Zionism into their religion. Not only do they embrace it as part of their belief system, they wear it as a banner of righteousness. In the November elections, the Judaized-Christians mandated “war” in the Mideast by an overwhelming majority of about Six to four by choosing the one candidate who promised war. Neo-Crusade is a more descriptive word than “war” because each one is an annihilation of more or less helpless peoples whose leader owns or does something our leaders covet or resent.

I recently listened to a sermon in a Lutheran (ELCA) Church. The traditional message was devoutly given, with a subtle admonition that each must be a follower of Christ to remain with him. But the format of the service was modern, employing the musical informality of the Judaized Christian movement. A guitarist and several harmonizers led a chorus projected by Power Point. The service mirrored those in thousands of Judaized-Christian churches, many of which now accept the “Christian Zionist” label.

I am told by members the ELCA, not only in this church, but nationwide, has adopted, to some degree, the format of the Judaized-Christian churches in order to compete, while attempting to retain its more traditional view of scripture, at least on this issue. Many denominations are attempting to look like the Judaized Christians without actually being like them.

The question is: has all of Christendom abandoned its traditional faith in Christ to put on the trappings of Judaization? The answer is clearly no. Many traditional churches know that what they see happening in the marketplace is compromising Christianity. But they do not have the tools or the courage to compete against it, and they tend to say very little. Project Strait Gate’s effort is to provide the tools. God must provide the courage it takes to be different.

Is the state of Israel the fulfillment of Biblical prophesy?

It can be generally stated, with a few exceptions, that mainline clergy members do not support the Judaized Christian premise that the present day State of Israel is the fulfillment of Biblical prophesy. They know it is biblical heresy to say so, and it is destructive. Jesus alone is the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophesy, and so every Christ follower should

proclaim.

The Judaized-Christian notion that Israel is the fulfillment comes from accepting the World Zionist claim that **“God gave us this land.”** It is the issue around which all war in the Mideast pivots. Without the assumption that Israel has a God-given claim to Arab-owned lands, there would be no reason for conflict in the Mideast. Israel would have to settle with its neighbors or admit to the world that it is a pariah and renegade. God’s alleged gift to them is Israel’s sole excuse for imprisoning its neighbors. Therefore, we must continually remind ourselves and seek the truth about the source of this claim, if we are to make any sense of the Mideast. America’s churches fail to do this.

Perhaps half the leaders of America’s churches accept Israel’s self-serving claim for “scriptural” reasons. These we call the Judaized churches, and the Mormons can be included with the Southern Baptists. Others, Mainline Protestants, Orthodox and Catholic, do not accept Israel’s claim of God-given rights to Arab lands on corrupted scriptural grounds, but many members do. Most of those who oppose, unfortunately, do not make an issue of it.

The Biblical basis of Israel’s claim

Israel bases its claim to Arab lands on the Old Testament. No New Testament verses are mentioned, because Israel does not even acknowledge that Jesus ever existed; and if they do, they have nothing good to say about Him. The principal relevant verses are found in the first book of their Torah, Genesis, Chapter 12:1-3, where God makes a promise to a man named Abram, whose great grandson many years later is said to be called “Israel.”

“[2] And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing.”

“[3] And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee. And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” Genesis 12:3, King James Version

Virtually all Judaized Christians interpret these two verses as a promise of Land to anyone who calls themselves an Israeli. It is a sort of last will and testament for perpetual ownership of what amounts to most of the Mideast. It is no surprise that most Israeli’s agree.

Judaized Christians accept the Israel’s land rights based on interpretive footnotes found in the Scofield Reference Bible and others, including the NIV Study Bible and the John McArthur Study Bible. Hundred of commentaries and teaching tools affirm the Israeli favorable view, using a variety of mechanisms of logic.

The Scofield notes, written in 1967, declare that the above verses mean:

“(2) God made an unconditional promise of blessings through Abram’s seed (a) to the nation of Israel to inherit a specific territory forever.”
(Scofield Reference Bible, 1967, page 19)

The fanatically pro-Zionist Scofield book goes so far as to state that:

“all Jews are natural descendants of Abraham” (page1138, note to John 8:37)

The Lutherans would be just as logical if they claimed that they are all natural descendants of Martin Luther. These bizarre interpretations are among the reasons we believe the World Zionist Movement, and not Cyrus I. Scofield, probably edited his book.*

The World Council of Churches, in a press release carried in Haaretz, Israel, on February 23, 2005, stated *“The main global body uniting non-Catholic Christians, encouraged members Tuesday to sell off investments in companies profiting from Israeli control of the West Bank and Gaza Strip.”* (Most Judaized Christian churches are not member of the WCC)

Not one word can be found anywhere in the **New Testament** that would justify taking the life of anyone, and killing those thousands of miles away who are not a threat should be unthinkable for one who calls himself by Jesus name. Nor is there anything in Jesus’ words that would ever justify a follower of Christ to fund those who kill their neighbors and their neighbors’ children, as Israeli solders and squatters do every day.

Part 2a: Why Some Christians Enable the Neo-Crusade and Others Oppose

Every follower of Christ must protest the callousness of celebrity Judaized Christian leaders toward the Arab people and Islam in general; we must object to the policy of the gradual liquidation of the Palestinians, which is justified by Israel, supported by our dollars from Washington, and enabled by the support of churchmen popularly called the "Christian Right." If your church is one that is silent, we ask you to learn and protest its enabling silence.

There is no Christian basis for racism in church. Jesus Christ spoke not one word that can in any way be interpreted to support the killing and taking of one people's land by another. Judaized Christian laymen need to follow Jesus and not their celebrity leaders. We must first object from inside the church, knowing we may not be heard. We must then leave the church without hesitation and without a look back, as Christ told his disciples to do when they were rejected. Our churches support "public policy" toward Israel, which can be summarized as the gradual liquidation of the Palestinian people, and serial wars against other tribes. It is impossible to be both a follower of Christ to be a party to this.

We must also recognize that "war" is and has been an economic policy of our country for two generations. War is whispered to be good business, and indeed it is for a few, including politicians, but is a sin for those who call themselves by Christ's name. God's people are expected to place a higher standard on life than we can expect from politicians. Mr. Bush is exposing, by his example, Judaized Christianity and its selfishness and callousness toward life.

Judaized Christian churches have adopted de facto, a racist theology that endorses a favored, or "chosen people." So-called Christian leaders have and are willing and ready to condemn a not-favored tribe to death. The unfavored tribe is any tribe that is at odds with political Israel, including the tribes of Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Lebanon. Judaized Christianity is an American spawning. If those who are committing the sin of supporting genocidal "wars" understand that they have nothing to gain and everything to lose, they will stop. Judaized Christians are numerous and are part of a huge communication network. It is part of the media and partly entertainment business. It may influence fully half of the American population. Anyone who doubts this need only to watch TBN television for a few hours of Benny Hinn and John Hagee, and count the evangelical churches in your phone book.

The Abuse of Scripture

Israel bases its claim to Arab lands on the Christian version of the Old Testament. Genesis, Chapter 12:1-3, is its argument and is supposedly similar to the Torah. God makes a promise to a man named Abram, whose grandson was called "Israel." Here, to quote from the King James Version, is the verse that is the subject of which may be the most monstrous distortion of Scripture in the modern history of Christianity:

"(1) Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee;

[2] And I will make of thee a great nation,"....."

The passage seems plain enough; God orders Abram go out and break new ground, promising that He, God, will lead him, protect him, give him a big family, and in the next verse, God promises Abram that he will have an undisclosed place in history that men will find to be a universal blessing.

"(3) And in thee all the nations of the earth will be blessed" (King James Version).

This blessing is not explained, but the one and only traditional view of this bit of Old Testament history is that from Abraham's family will come the Messiah, Christ the Lord. This is the significance of Abraham in Christian history.

Similarly, composer Frederick Handel found the words for his lyrics of the wonderful oratorio, **Messiah**, in the Old Testament book of Isaiah, of interest to followers of Christ because it is a prophesy of Christ, the Messiah's coming. .

The present-day state of Israel's political leaders plucked the land argument, from the footnotes of the Judaized Christians' contrived study bible; this handy but faulted land deed was planted there a generation earlier by those who paid or otherwise influenced a convicted

professional forger named Cyrus I Scofield.

Today's Zionists interpret these few words said to be spoken to Abram as a promise of a land grant to the state of Israel, a state which did not exist until 3000 years after the "promise." To them, it is a sort of last will-and-testament for perpetual ownership of what amounts to be most of the Middle East. This blood-related gift assumes all Israelis are Abraham's physical heirs. There is no proof of this, but Oxford Press actually wrote this in the Scofield Bible footnotes after Scofield's death. There is not a strand of Abraham's DNA connecting Prime Minister Sharon, or any other Israeli, to anyone in the Bible.

But even if Ariel Sharon could prove his DNA matches Abraham's to the nub, so what? Land is not conferred by lineage without a deed. Arab lands, those that have value, have land titles and records of occupancy. Arabs have deeds. Most Israelis I've met said, as Ariel Sharon says, "God gave it to us," not caring in the least if one believes them, because they do not believe it themselves.

Judaized Christians in the US also proudly support **Israeli racist hate groups** operating both in the US and Israel. Some of these organizations are too radical even for the Israelis, who consider them a threat to peace. (* Israel) One anti-Arab hate group that calls itself **Christians for Israel's Biblical Land Right (CIBLR)** is touring the US with a movie aimed at Christian audiences, Judaizing them to unconditional support of Israel's brutal efforts in holding possession of what is left of the Palestinians' land. The movie does the fanatical C. I. Scofield one better by interpreting Genesis 12 as follows:

"God unconditionally promised all the land to Israel forever" (2) "Israel (the present state) will be a blessing to all the other nations of the world."

How brazen. This Israeli organization, masquerading as followers of Christ, tells us God's promise did not mean a savior named Jesus, but instead means that God's promise of a blessing to the world is through a corrupted, agnostic warring state with one of the highest abortion rates in the world, that conveniently named itself "Israel." What an insult to Jesus, what blight on the name of Christ, and those who follow Him! Amazingly, **CIBLR** raises its funds from Judaized Christians.

Are we expected to believe, contrary to all traditional teachings, that this politically criminal and remarkably immoral oligarchy is God's blessing to all nations? Judaized arguments for Israeli land rights fall apart like termite-infected wood when you pick them up to look at them. The only truly honest way to characterize the Judaized Christian position is "Balderdash!" which means, pompous nonsense.

It is still OK to be a traditional Christian

Traditional thinking is not extinct. Mainline Protestants and Orthodox Christianity lost membership to the evangelicals over the last 125 years after the then neo-evangelical movement was dumped on our shores, another gift from England, where it never flourished.

In contrast to the Judaized Christians and the Israelis, American mainline churches clearly state the traditional Christian interpretation of Genesis 12. For instance, the Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELCA), uses a reference book called **The Accent Bible** (I found it in the pews of a church) which provides a single definitive footnote explaining Genesis 12:1-3. It clearly states that the blessing was the *Messiah called Jesus who would come to bring salvation to all men.*

The overwhelming majority of Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Catholics, and Orthodox leaders, regardless of what other faults they may have, teach **that Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies.** They also do not teach the Judaized idea of a new temple in Jerusalem, mystical wars, a red heifer sacrifice, Armageddon, and imminent end times, or a convenient "rapture" for the few. Most mainline Reverends, Pastors, and Priests would at least admit that their faith does not support the idea of a political state of Israel as a God icon, nor that Israel should be appeased by throwing one Arab country after another upon its burning altars.

But we find that few Catholics, Orthodox Priests, or Muslim Clerics, or mainline Pastors would be able to explain the powerful political forces that have supported Judaized Christianity since it snowballed beginning in the late 19th Century. They will privately acknowledge the apostasy of Judaized Christianity, but have no explanation as to its amazing growth.

Distorted commentaries influence potential followers

The Judaized Christian movement is only 125 years old, at most. It won its early converts from the complacent mainline churches in the early 20th Century, offering a religion of selfishness and rapture watching, instead of one that required (but failed to demand) service and dedication.. The old church lacked sincerity; the new one offered sincere and loving self-service. But now mainline laymen have also been “Judaized” with outside church bible studies, and by bible guides and reference books bought in Judaized bible bookstores written by Timothy LaHaye and thousands of other commentators.

Catholics, Lutherans, Methodists and Presbyterians, especially women, have been active in the popular **Precepts Ministries, Bible Study Fellowship, and Community Bible Study**, all of which are proudly “dispensational”(Judaized). Mainline churches even loan their facilities for their studies. This, we think, can be likened to the hens renting the coup to the foxes for night school. Commentaries published by Judaized Christian authors commonly find their way into traditional church members’ homes.

How to know when you’re being conned by a “Christian” writer.

One of the most successful and damaging commentary writers was Henrietta C. Mears, who died in 1963. She wrote **What the Bible is All About**, which has over 4 million copies in print in numerous editions. It is blessed with a forward written by none other than Billy Graham. Mainline church libraries and bookstores still sell it, probably because it is so easy to understand. Mears tells you what each book of the bible is about in a paragraph or two. In these explanations, most of which are helpful, can be found the seeds of giant distortion.

How do you know if you are about to be misled before you buy a best-selling “Christian” book? A very good way is to look first at what the author says about Genesis 12 and Matthew 25. If it fails either of these integrity tests, don’t let it in the house. Let’s look at what Mears says on page 40 about Genesis 12, Abram’s promise:

“He (God) called a man named Abram to ...go to an unknown land where God would make him the father of a mighty nation. This begins the story of God’s chosen people, Israel.”

What is wrong with this is that she has deliberately not pointed out that there have been two “Israels” 3000 years apart, and they are not connected in the Christian Bible. In 1953 the traditional Christian view was that this promise was the first of many prophecies of the Messiah, Jesus Christ our Lord. The tribe called Israelites no longer existed in 1953, when Mears wrote this, but the new state of Israel had just come into existence in 1948. Mears had to know her statement would cause her readers to impute God’s promise to that new state *that had just stolen the old tribe’s good name*. Obviously, Henrietta Mears, like the “Left Behind” rapture fiction writers Tim LaHaye and Hal Lindsay, believe the new political state is a prophecy fulfilled, and she wants her readers to believe that, too. This is the first fundamental falsehood that is found in every book and cranny of the Judaized Christian literature.

What the Bible is All About fails the second test with an even lower score. On page 361 in a chapter misnamed “**Understanding Matthew**,” we are told:

*“ He (Jesus) foretold the coming of the world after his ascension until He comes back in glory to judge the nations as to their treatment of **His brethren, the Jews** (Matthew 25).”*

Lest anyone miss her meaning, Mears explains, “*It is the judgment of the gentile people concerning their attitude toward God’s people.*”

Thus, Henrietta Mears again makes the present day state of Israel and, in fact, anyone who claims to be Jewish, including Elizabeth Taylor and Sammy Davis Junior out to be the “chosen people.” This makes Jesus a racist in total opposition to what He is reported to have said in this very chapter. Christ’s words say nothing about “the Jews” or any race, but tell his followers that as they do unto the least of his creatures, so are they doing also to Him. It is heresy to believe that Jesus wants us to be good only toward “Jews” and Israeli citizens. It is basic to traditional Christianity that all men, even our enemies, must be loved as brothers. This is amplified in Jesus’ story of the **Good Samaritan** and too many more to mention.

Mears’ **What the Bible is All About**, would have us believe that our ticket to

heaven or hell depends on how we have treated Jews during our lifetime. Oxford University Press' Scofield Reference Bible also fails the Matthew 25 test and goes even further by declaring "*anti-Semitism*" to be a "*sin*" (footnote page 19-20) and predicts that "nations" will be punished in the future for anti-Semitism. Oxford University Press must not know that countries do not sin, men do.

Invariably, Judaized Christian commentaries promote similar, racist views of Genesis 12 and Matthew 25. A reader can eliminate most Judaized books by scanning the footnotes and commentaries of these two passages.

The fruit of Judaized Christianity

The blame for the Neo-Crusade and every bit of destruction in the Middle East should properly be placed on those leaders, be they the Christian Right or the mainline Pastors and Priests who are required by their own faith to demand peace, and yet instead, accept, if not openly campaign for, what they erroneously call "war." I am not the first one to notice this and write it down. F. Furman Kearney explained it in his classic 1986 book, **Middle East Crisis in Biblical Perspective**, in which he used the scholars' term "*pre-millennialist*," where we say Judaized Christian.

"Militant pre-millennialism and Zionism must bear the moral responsibility for recent bloodshed in the Middle East and for more extensive bloodshed in World War III, if it comes as predicted by militant pre-millennialism."

And,

"Had the state of Israel not been established in 1947, the history of the Middle East for the last 35 years would be entirely different. We cannot, of course, know what history would have been. We can know, however, that bloodshed during the last 35 years has been caused by pre-millennial and Zionistic agitation that resulted in the creation of the state of Israel."

Kearley, who was a professor at **Abilene Christian University**, and head of its graduate studies program, also opined that the blame lies in Christians who "*cannot pray for peace in the Mid-East*" and who are blinded by the very prejudice that Jesus would denounce. Dr. Kearley understood and wrote this clearly, five years before the first bombing of Iraq in 1990. Judaized-Christians were already enabling what he called "World War III" against Islam. (*scholar)

We agree with Dr. Kearley; it is the Judaized Christian churches in America who are primarily responsible for the systematic annihilation of the people of Iraq, Gaza, and a dozen other past and pending sites. They are also responsible for the 1500 American lives lost, which only scratches the surface of the lives destroyed and scarred by those who forced them to perform extermination of others.

The mainline denomination leaders, who understand the heresy and say nothing, share the guilt. However, it is with the latter group that reform may and can begin. This time they must reform the Judaized. One could accurately reduce Judaized Christianity's dilemma to a bumper sticker slogan that every mainline church needs to proclaim: **Jesus, Not Israel, is the Fulfillment of Bible Prophecy.**

If the mainline churches would tell the truth about the corruption of Scriptures and were unafraid to discuss the baselessness of the Judaized Christianity, they would start to win back the lost multitudes from the Judaized ranks. Some show signs of doing this. The World Council of Churches, the Presbyterian Church USA, and the American Episcopal Church are among groups condemning, sanctioning, or divesting of companies who do war business with Israel.

Judaized Christian churches are led to believe serial wars are in their best interest but they, too, will find themselves to be victims. Some already are victims: How many of our dead military are no doubt from American Judaized churches, where not "serving" is thought of as un-patriotic, especially against Israel's perceived enemies. But the Neo-Crusade is also destructive to members who are balancing their beliefs against their children's lives. Judaized Christian laymen should be and can be persuaded to abandon their support of the Neo-Crusade. They need to embrace peace as Jesus did. They soon will do so because they will learn it is not in their best material interest, and that they are its spiritual victims.

How to confront the Judaized Christian

The Strait Gate Project confronts Judaized Christian churches. We confront them through the media and we confront them on their very doorsteps, in front of their very members. Our vigils' purpose is to let members know that there is something very wrong in

their organization. Project Strait Gate was begun in the street, our contest will be won over the Internet, where we can reach and have reached millions, and can reach many more. To do this enormous task in the face of enormous resistance, we must have your help.

Strait Gate Ministries, P.O. Box 14491, Scottsdale, AZ 85267, USA

<<http://www.whtt.org/whtt.shtml?articles/050309Wh2.htm>>

WASHING MACHINE

From *Hustler magazine*, August 1993:

WHITEWASHING HITLER Taking the Gas Out of Nazi Infamy

Report by **Jim Redden**

***Some historians say Hitler had no master plan to exterminate the Jews in World War II. What are Nazis without the Holocaust?
Irving declares that he has never come across a document proving that Hitler ordered the total eradication of European Jews.***

October 16, 1992: David Irving, a British historian specializing in World War II, is speaking at Mount Hood Community College near Portland, Oregon. Irving is an advocate of Holocaust revisionism, a controversial movement that disputes the historical accuracy of the widely held version of what happened to European Jews at the hands of the Germans during Hitler's Third Reich.

Police dressed in riot gear line the road that leads to the windowless building where Irving is scheduled to talk. The police have been summoned to protect people who wish to attend Irving's speech from an angry mob harassing everyone who tries to enter the building. An elderly couple slips through the corridor of Plexiglass shields held by police and reaches the front doors. From the mob, a young man yells, "We know where you live!"

Shaken, the couple approaches a police officer stationed in the lobby. "They said they know where we live," the man says in a quavering voice. The cop answers coolly, "I'm sorry, sir, but there's nothing we can do about that," leaving the couple to wonder if a late-night fire bombing is the price they will pay for attending a history lecture.

* * * *

At age 54, David Irving has authored more than a dozen books on World War II. Unlike many chroniclers of the past, Irving does not rely on the writings of other historians when researching his works, but insists on seeing original documents whenever possible. According to the *New York Times Book Review*, "Mr. Irving is an indefatigable interviewer, a prodigy of enterprise and industry, a researcher who almost literally [leaves] no stone unturned and [succeeds] in digging up papers, letters and diaries which [are] believed to be lost or nonexistent, or which escaped, for other reasons, earlier writers. His dogged persistence puts many professional historians to shame."

After more than ten years researching declassified war records, Irving declares that he has never come across a document proving that Hitler ordered the total eradication of European Jews, no written or other correspondence proving that Hitler was aware of concentration-camp gassings, and no evidence that Hitler ordered the death of the Jews in any of the top-secret Nazi radio transmissions that were intercepted by the Allies during the war. As a result of this research, Irving concluded that Hitler did not, in fact, order the notorious Final Solution.

Irving calls the Holocaust a legend. "Historians have all been busy quoting each other. They've been pumping hot air into this bubble, and the bubble has been getting bigger and bigger and more and more unstable. These professors know the truth, but they're terrified that some irresponsible idiot is going to come along and prick that bubble. And," he adds with comic timing, "I am that prick."

Mainstream historians acknowledge the lack of a documented Final Solution order

from Hitler, believing the Fuehrer was too shrewd to leave behind palpable evidence of his evildoing.

"[That Hitler would not sign a written order] is hardly surprising considering the monstrosity of the crimes being committed," notes British historian Alan Bullock.

In May 1988 Irving provided expert testimony on behalf of Canadian Ernst Zundel, who was charged with violating Canada's "false news" laws by reprinting a 28-page booklet titled *Did Six Million Really Die?* Irving produced a report prepared by Fred Leuchter, an American authority on gas chambers who performed forensic tests on the gas chamber at Auschwitz. Leuchter's report found no indication of traces of poisonous gas in the walls of the gas chamber and alleged the chamber was, consequently, a fake.

Irving testified that there were no grounds to support the existence of a Nazi plan to exterminate Jews. Upon returning to Europe, Irving published a special edition of the Leuchter report, writing an introduction in which he boldly dismissed the traditional version of the Holocaust as a "well-financed and brilliantly successful postwar publicity campaign."

Publication of the Leuchter report in Europe led to Irving's arrest. By alleging that the Auschwitz gas chamber was built AFTER the war, he was convicted of a serious crime in Germany. In May 1992, a Munich court fined Irving the equivalent of \$7,000 for violating a German law against "defamation of the memory of the dead."

Books and pamphlets challenging various aspects of the Holocaust began to appear shortly after the end of WWII. One of the first revisionist texts was written by a French concentration-camp survivor named **Paul Rassinier**. Rassinier's books, *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* [*The Lie of Ulysses*], published in 1949, and *Le Drame des Juifs Européens* [*The Drama of the European Jews*], published in 1964, claimed Rassinier had not seen any evidence of the mass gassings that had come to light after the camps were liberated.

In the 1970s, Holocaust revisionism saw public debate in the United States. In 1976, Dr. **Arthur Butz**, an American professor from Northwestern University, published *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Butz argued that although Jews were persecuted by the Nazis, they were not specifically targeted for mass extermination. According to Butz, less than half a million people died in Nazi concentration camps during WWII, and only a fraction of them were Jews.

[**Rassinier's and Butz' books are online at**
<<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/livres.html>>]

Today, the central core of Holocaust revisionism in the U.S. is the Institute for Historical Review (IHR) in Costa Mesa, California. Founded in 1979 by conspiracy theorist Willis Carto, the IHR largely functions as a clearing house for a broad range of revisionist propaganda, including such titles as *Dealing in Hate: The Development of Anti-German Propaganda*; *My Father, Rudolph Hess*; and *Auschwitz: Truth or Lie -- An Eyewitness Report*. The IHR also holds annual conferences at which Irving and other revisionists present their latest findings. The definition of the term HOLOCAUST lies at the heart of the revisionism controversy. Since WWII, the expression has been used to describe a systematic Nazi effort -- either originating with Hitler or approved by him -- to exterminate all of Europe's Jews. Commonly known as the Final Solution, the plan is thought to have culminated in the construction and operation of the gas chambers at Nazi concentration camps.

Opponents of Holocaust revisionism -- those who embrace the traditional version of the war (the American Jewish Committee [AJC] and the Anti-Defamation League [ADL] in particular) -- consider the fight against Holocaust revisionism a crusade against a growing army of neo-Nazis around the world. In a series of extensively researched briefing papers, the AJC and the ADL argue that Hitler's dream of an Aryan world did not die with him, but comprises a conspiracy that stretches from the U.S. to Europe and the Middle East. They refer to their opponents not as Holocaust revisionists, but Holocaust DENIERS.

"The movement to deny that six million Jews were exterminated by the Nazis during World War II is a weapon of anti-Semitic extremist groups operating in the United States and abroad," claims the ADL. Jewish advocacy groups and their supporters admit that legitimate Holocaust reappraisal has occurred since the end of WWII. For example, it was widely assumed after the war that 2.5 million Jews were gassed to death at Auschwitz alone. Recently Yahuda Bauer, the director of the Division of Holocaust Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem's Institute of Contemporary Jewry, announced that the actual number was probably closer to 1.35 million.

Though this revision raises questions about the total number of Jews killed by the Nazis, the questions raised by Holocaust revisionists are seen as part of a larger agenda of

discrimination.

Irving denies that his views on the Holocaust are anti-Semitic. "The revisionist scene [incorporates] people from the field of history, like myself, to people who are at the other end of the spectrum, who find in revisionism a [means] to vent their anti-Semitism," he explains.

Holocaust revisionism is a common link between many overtly racist and anti-Semitic groups, such as the California-based White Aryan Resistance, which produces a cable-access television show called RACE AND REASON. Some viewers claimed to be offended by an early episode of the program that opened with canned laughter playing behind WWII film footage of corpses at Nazi concentration camps.

But support for Holocaust revisionism comes from pro-Semitic sides as well. A young Jew named David Cole visited Auschwitz in late 1992 and videotaped an interview with Dr. Franciszek Piper, the curator of the Holocaust museum at the camp. In the interview, Piper admitted that the gas chamber shown to tourists was remodeled by the Soviets after the war. In Cole's view, this statement confirms Irving's support of the Leuchter Report.

Mainstream historians supporting the traditional version of the Holocaust point to an abundance of eyewitness accounts and Nazi confessions collected during numerous war-crimes trials. At the International Military Tribunal, otherwise known as the Nuremberg Trial, Auschwitz commander Rudolf Hess testified that he personally arranged the gassing of two million Jews between June 1941 and the end of 1943.

Revisionists argue that the Germans, obsessive insect-haters, shipped large quantities of Zyklon-B to concentration camps during the war to kill lice.

The presence of gas chambers at several Nazi concentration camps is the most incriminating evidence of Hitler's genocidal intent. Unsuspecting Jews were tricked into entering the deadly chambers, usually under the pretext that the rooms were large showers. Once the doors locked behind them, poisonous gas spewed out of the shower heads, killing great numbers in a matter of minutes. The bodies were then hauled out, and either burned in adjacent crematoriums or dumped into pits. According to eyewitness accounts and Nazi testimony, this process was repeated until millions of Jews had been gassed.

Physical evidence of gas-chamber extermination is hard to come by. Mainstream historians agree that the Germans installed gas chambers at only seven camps in Poland -- Auschwitz (and its satellite facility, Birkenau), Stutthof, Treblinka, Chelmno, Sobibor, Majdanek, and Belzec. All of these camps were liberated by Soviet troops, and Poland became part of the Soviet Union after the war. The result was that during the long decades of the Cold War, the camps and the tons of documents captured by the Russians have been restricted from Western researchers.

Most of the concentration camps were destroyed by the Germans before they fell into Soviet hands. Many of the buildings were blown up, including those that reportedly housed the gas chambers.

Today, the only gas chambers extant are found at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek. Basic operating equipment is missing at all of the facilities. None of the chambers currently have air-tight doors, venting systems for piping gas or exhaust systems for removing the gas after the victims have been killed.

Historians agree that the gas chambers used a cyanide-based insecticide called Zyklon-B. Revisionists argue that the Germans, obsessive insect-haters, shipped large quantities of Zyklon-B to concentration camps during the war to kill lice and other insects. Delousing rooms, the doubters point out, can still be found at many of the camps.

More scientifically minded revisionists argue that Zyklon-B does not vanish without a trace, but bonds permanently with porous surfaces like bricks and mortar. According to Rick Gates, a chemist with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality who is not involved in the revisionist debate, "Cyanide traces can remain in [such materials] a long time."

Acting on this scientific principle, Fred Leuchter and several companions traveled to Poland in 1988, where they took samples from the walls and floors of the gas chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek. According to the Leuchter report, only minimal traces of cyanide could be found in the gas chambers. This shortage of forensic evidence leads Leuchter to conclude that the rooms could not have been used as gas chambers, and revisionists take this as proof that the gas chamber story is a hoax.

Jean-Claude Pressac, author of *Auschwitz: Design and Fabrication of the Gas Chambers*, refutes Leuchter's theory, alleging that the Germans used enough Zyklon-B to kill people, but not enough to leave substantial traces. Pressac, a French pharmacist, uses complex chemical formulas to prove that traces of cyanide would be found in the delousing rooms,

but not in the gas chambers.

"A hydrocyanic gas concentration of 0.3 grams per cubic meter -- a lethal dose -- is immediately fatal to a man, while killing lice requires a concentration of five grams per cubic meter for a period of at least two hours," claims Pressac. "Maintaining that concentration for six hours will kill [every insect infesting a person]. The dose used at Birkenau was lethal 40 to 70 times over (12 to 20 grams per cubic inch) -- which infallibly killed 1,000 persons in less than five minutes."

Without a master plan to eradicate Europe's Jewry, the revisionists argue, the Nazis were no worse than many other military aggressors in recorded history. "The killings [perpetrated by the Nazis], the pits and so on, were no worse than what the Americans did in Vietnam in My Lai," claims Irving, referring to the March 16, 1968, slaughter by American ground troops of nearly 300 unarmed and unresisting Vietnam civilians, many of whom were forced to stand on the edge of a ditch and machine-gunned. "There are eyewitness descriptions of both. But the idea of setting up killing factories, with the gas chambers and so on, implies a certain degree of industrialization and precision that, frankly, I don't think [belongs] in the record."

Jewish advocacy organizations are not willing to be drawn into a public debate with Holocaust revisionists. They contend that the Holocaust is not a matter to be argued and that, for the sake of the memories of countless families whose relations perished at Nazi hands, the claims of the revisionists should not be dignified with public responses. "We need not waste time or reeffort answering the deniers' contentions," states Jewish historian Deborah Lipstadt. "It would be never-ending to respond to arguments posed by those who freely falsify findings, quote out of context and simply dismiss reams of testimony. Their commitment is to an ideology, and their 'findings' are shaped to support it."

The AJC and the ADL routinely publish and distribute the results of lengthy background checks indicating that revisionists are not merely disinterested academics, but anti-Semitic political activists. The ADL has identified former Institute for Historical Review director David McCalden as the founder of the British National Party, an offshoot of the neo-Nazi National Front, and reports that revisionist writer Arthur Butz addressed the 1985 convention of the Nation of Islam, led by notorious anti-Semite Louis Farrakhan.

Irving has a proposal for settling the controversy: a full enquiry. Says Irving, "I think it would be most satisfactory if the Jews themselves investigated and discarded the legend [of the Final Solution], because any other solution is going to lead to an increase in anti-Semitism. The world will say, 'Look how they tried to get away with it for 50 years!'"

This article was manually transcribed by the System Operator of the "Banished CPU" computer bulletin board system, which is located in Portland, Oregon, U.S.A.

DENIALIST

Faurisson affair

The Faurisson affair is a term given to a minor academic scandal in wake of a book by Robert Faurisson, a Holocaust denialist. The scandal largely dealt with the inclusion (without permission) of an essay by Chomsky *Some Elementary Comments on the Rights of Freedom of Expression* [1] (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8010-free-expression.html>) as a introduction to Faurisson's book. Responding to a request for comment in a climate of attacks on Faurisson, Chomsky defended Faurisson's previous writing (though not his claims) on free speech grounds. His defense was the target of subsequent accusations by various pro-Israeli academics and groups that sought to discredit Chomsky by claiming a deeper philosophical and political association between him and Faurisson.

Critics charged that Chomsky's defense of Faurisson, at best went too far: As John Goldsmith writes, "Unsympathetic critics used it as an opportunity to brand Chomsky with anti-Semitic labels, but even critics potentially sympathetic to Chomsky's political views felt his remarks showed lack of judgment." [2] (<http://humanities.uchicago.edu/faculty/goldsmith/barsky.htm>) Chomsky was pressured to defend himself, in an essay called *His Right to Say It* [3] (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8102-right-to-say.html>), in which he explained his defense of Faurisson, distanced himself from Faurisson's written claims, and denounced the spectacle given to the lacking scholarship of Faurisson, while showing a

similar lack of scholarship in their attacks.

Faurisson's letters to *Le Monde*

In December 1978 and January 1979, Robert Faurisson, a French professor of literature at the University of Lyon, published two letters in *Le Monde* claiming that the gas chambers used by the Nazis to exterminate the Jews did not exist.

[4] (http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v19/v19n3p40_Faurisson.html)

Subsequently, Faurisson was assaulted by Jewish students ("lightly molested", according to Nadine Fresco [5] (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/Fresco81a>)). His classes were suspended on the grounds that the university could not guarantee his safety. In 1989, long after the affair died down, Faurisson was beaten much more badly, suffering a broken jaw, broken ribs, and head injuries. Image of Faurisson in hospital.

Petition signed by Chomsky

In the fall of 1979, Chomsky's friend Serge Thion asked him to sign a petition in defense of Faurisson's freedom of speech:

Dr. Robert Faurisson has served as a respected professor of twentieth-century French literature and document criticism for over four years at the University of Lyon-2 in France. Since 1974 he has been conducting extensive historical research into the "Holocaust" question.

Since he began making his findings public, Professor Faurisson has been subject to a vicious campaign of harassment, intimidation, slander and physical violence in a crude attempt to silence him. Fearful officials have even tried to stop him from further research by denying him access to public libraries and archives.

We strongly protest these efforts to deprive Professor Faurisson of his freedom of speech and expression, and we condemn the shameful campaign to silence him.

We strongly support Professor Faurisson's just right of academic freedom and we demand that university and government officials do everything possible to ensure his safety and the free exercise of his legal rights.

The petition was signed by 500 people, Chomsky included.

A number of French intellectuals criticized Chomsky's signing of the petition, describing the extent of Faurisson's Holocaust denial and his ties to neo-Nazi groups [6] (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/Fresco81a>). In particular, Pierre Vidal-Naquet criticized the wording of the petition as "scandalous", saying that it implied Faurisson was a serious researcher rather than a propagandist [7] (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/VidalNaquet92a/>).

Preface to *Mémoire en défense*

Chomsky subsequently wrote an essay entitled *Some Elementary Comments on the Rights of Freedom of Expression* (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8010-free-expression.html>), in which he attacked his critics for failing to respect the principle of freedom of speech, and defended Faurisson himself against charges that he was an anti-Semite or a neo-Nazi.

Chomsky wrote:

Faurisson's conclusions are diametrically opposed to views I hold and have frequently expressed in print (for example, in my book *Peace in the Middle East*, where I describe the Holocaust as "the most fantastic outburst of collective insanity in human history"). But it is elementary that freedom of expression (including academic freedom) is not to be restricted to views of which one approves, and that it is precisely in the case of views that are almost universally despised and condemned that this right must be most vigorously defended. It is easy enough to defend those who need no defense or to join in unanimous (and often justified) condemnation of a violation of civil rights by some official enemy.

[8] (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8102-right-to-say.html>)

In defense of Faurisson himself, he wrote:

Let me add a final remark about Faurisson's alleged "anti-Semitism." Note first that even if Faurisson were to be a rabid anti-Semite and fanatic pro-Nazi -- such charges have been presented to me in private correspondence that it would be improper to cite in detail here -- this would have no bearing whatsoever on the legitimacy of the defense of his civil

rights. On the contrary, it would make it all the more imperative to defend them since, once again, it has been a truism for years, indeed centuries, that it is precisely in the case of horrendous ideas that the right of free expression must be most vigorously defended; it is easy enough to defend free expression for those who require no such defense. Putting this central issue aside, is it true that Faurisson is an anti-Semite or a neo-Nazi? As noted earlier, I do not know his work very well. But from what I have read -- largely as a result of the nature of the attacks on him -- I find no evidence to support either conclusion. Nor do I find credible evidence in the material that I have read concerning him, either in the public record or in private correspondence. As far as I can determine, he is a relatively apolitical liberal of some sort.

[9] (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8102-right-to-say.html>)

Chomsky granted permission for the essay to be used for any purpose. Serge Thion then used it as a preface when publishing a book by Faurisson, without Chomsky's knowledge. Later Chomsky requested that the essay not be used in this manner, since he believed the French intellectual community was so incapable of understanding freedom of speech that it would only confuse them further, but his request came too late for the book to be changed. Chomsky subsequently said that asking for the preface to be removed is his one regret in the matter.

Chomsky's essay sparked an even greater controversy. Critics such as Pierre Vidal-Naquet attacked him not for defending the principle of freedom of speech, but for defending Faurisson personally against charges of anti-Semitism. [10] (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/VidalNaquet81b/>)

Other critics held that Faurisson's statements were the archetype of anti-Semitism, and that the logical conclusion of Chomsky's statement would be that Nazism was not anti-Semitic. The main argument for this is that Holocaust deniers are not interested in truth, but "motivated by racism, extremism, and virulent anti-Semitism" ([11] (http://www.adl.org/braun/dim_14_1_deniers.asp) Deborah Lipstadt, in *Dimensions*, the journal of the ADL).

Chomsky's response

Subsequently, Chomsky argued that there was a difference between the acceptance of historical facts (in this case, the existence of gas chambers, denied by Faurisson) and the attitude towards certain people (hatred of the Jews, anti-Semitism, perhaps also held by Faurisson):

"I see no anti-Semitic implications in denial of the existence of gas chambers or even denial of the Holocaust. Nor would there be anti-Semitic implications, per se, in the claim that the Holocaust (whether one believes it took place or not) is being exploited, viciously so, by apologists for Israeli repression and violence. I see no hint of anti-Semitic implications in Faurisson's work." (quoted in *Noam Chomsky's Search for the Truth*)

He later elaborated:

"In that context, I made a further point: even denial of the Holocaust would not prove that a person is an anti-Semite. I presume that that point too is not subject to contention. Thus if a person ignorant of modern history were told of the Holocaust and refused to believe that humans are capable of such monstrous acts, we would not conclude that he is an anti-Semite. That suffices to establish the point at issue." [12] (<http://chomsky.info/letters/1989----.htm>)

Final thoughts

In *His Right to Say It* (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8102-right-to-say.html>), published in *The Nation*, Chomsky states: "It seems to me something of a scandal that it is even necessary to debate these issues two centuries after Voltaire defended the right of free expression for views he detested. It is a poor service to the memory of the victims of the Holocaust to adopt a central doctrine of their murderers." His argument stressed the conceptual distinction between *endorsing someone's view* and *defending his right to say it*. Insofar as the latter does not imply the former, condemning censorship should not be read as espousing the censored view.

External links

Faurisson's Three Letters to *Le Monde*

(http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v19/v19n3p40_Faurisson.html) — Robert Faurisson, December 1978, January 1979, February 1979
Hidden Alliances (<http://ftp.nizkor.org/ftp.py?people/c/cohn.werner/partners-in-hate//hidden-alliances.02>) — Werner Cohn (includes the text of the petition signed by Chomsky in the fall of 1979)
The Denial of the Dead (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/Fresco81a>) — Nadine Fresco, *Les Temps Modernes*, June 1980 (revised 1981)
A Paper Eichmann (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/VidalNaquet92a/>) — Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Esprit*, September 1980 (revised 1992)
Some Elementary Comments on the Rights of Freedom of Expression (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8010-free-expression.html>) — Noam Chomsky, October 1980
His Right to Say It (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/articles/8102-right-to-say.html>) — Noam Chomsky, *The Nation*, February 1981
On Faurisson and Chomsky (<http://www.anti-rev.org/textes/VidalNaquet81b/>) — Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Democracy*, April 1981 (revised 1987)
The Chorus and the Cassandra (<http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/other/85-hitchens.html>) — Christopher Hitchens, *Grand Street*, Autumn 1985
Reply to Werner Cohn (<http://www.chomsky.info/letters/19890601.htm>) — Noam Chomsky, *Outlook*, June 1989
French Holocaust Denier on Ban of Al-Manar: 'The Big Lie of the Alleged Holocaust ... is the Shield of Jewish Tyranny... Destroy it' (http://www.intelligence.org.il/eng/memri/feb_e_05.htm), Professor Robert Faurisson, in an interview to Iran's Mehr News Agency (MNA) about France's decision to ban Al-Manar TV

Dr John Grohol's Psych Central

<http://psychcentral.com/mwiki/index.php/Faurisson_affair#Preface_to_Memoire_et_defense>

FROM RUSSIA WITH LOVE

I hope you enjoy Eduard Hodos' "The Jewish Syndrome", or at least the part of it which is on the Orthodox Anti-Globalists' website. I think it is very funny and it completely demolishes the illusions about Putin which might be fostered by for instance Alexandr Dugin or similar New Right Putin epigones.

Eduard Hodos is definitely a real person, I believe he is a Ukrainian Reform Jew. See <<http://www.oag.ru/views/love.html>>

+++++

This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to:

<<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>>. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.

OTHER AAARGH MONTHLY PUBLICATIONS

<<http://www.geocities.com/ilrestodelsiclo>>

El Paso del Ebro

Das kausale Nexusblatt

Il Resto del Siclo

Conseils de Révision

La Gazette du Golfe et des banlieues (multilingual)

<<http://ggb.0catch.com>>